

VOLUME X

OCTOBER, 1924

NUMBER 6

BULLETIN

OF

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

REPORT ON CLARK UNIVERSITY
GENERAL READING FOR UNDERGRADUATES

PUBLISHED BY
THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

225 CHURCH STREET, EASTON, PA.

EDITORIAL OFFICE, 222 CHARLES RIVER ROAD

CAMBRIDGE

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

General Announcements

Annual Meeting.....	3
American Council on Education.....	3
Junior Colleges, Normal Schools.....	3
Assistant Director.....	5
American University Union in Europe.....	5
League of Nations. Committee on Intellectual Cooperation..	8

Committees

New Chairmen and Members.....	11
Committee A, Academic Freedom and Tenure, Reorganization.....	11
Tennessee: A Professorial Fiasco, <i>The New Republic</i>	11
Letters to Editors of the New Republic, <i>A. O. Leuschner</i> , <i>A. O. Lovejoy</i>	15

Local and Chapter Notes

California Chapter.....	19
Chicago: The Individual Undergraduate and the College Community, <i>E. H. Wilkins</i>	19
Iowa State Chapter.....	21
Northwestern: Ideals and Aims of the College of Liberal Arts.....	21
Oklahoma and Ohio Wesleyan.....	23

Recent Educational Discussion

Tenures in Colleges and Universities, <i>R. C. Brooks</i>	24
Our Universities, <i>J. J. Chapman</i>	28
The American University and Some of Its Foes, <i>D. S. Jordan</i>	30
The Content of a Liberal Education, <i>D. S. Kimball</i>	32
Tendencies in Professional Education, <i>S. P. Capen</i>	35
Report on Clark University.....	40
Committee G. Report on General Reading for Undergraduates	108

Membership

Members Elected.....	121
Nominations for Membership.....	122

GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

ANNUAL MEETING.—The Annual Meeting of the Association will be held in Washington on Saturday, December 27th, and Monday, December 29th, in connection with the Convocation Week meetings of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Fuller information in regard to the program will be published in the November *Bulletin* and circulated in the meantime to officers of Local Chapters.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION.—The Annual Meeting of the Council was held in Washington, May 2d and 3d last. Announcement was made of the discontinuance of the University Union in Europe as an independent organization and of the future maintenance of the Paris and London offices under the direction of the Council. By the adoption of closer relations with the Institute of International Education, four of its trustees will be elected each year from a list of eight nominees by the Council.

The Director's Report showed that the Register of the Personnel Division now includes 17,000 college teachers and that this number is steadily increasing. The total expenditures for the fiscal year were approximately \$29,000, against an estimate of \$32,000. Beside the estimated resources of \$36,000 for 1924-25, the following special grants will be available: for the Educational Finance Inquiry, \$35,000; for International Education Relations, \$35,000; for Foreign Language Study, \$70,000; for Foreign Travel and Study, \$9,000. Sixteen colleges have been added to the list of institutional members.

JUNIOR COLLEGES, NORMAL SCHOOLS.—A report from the Committee on Standards dealt with the questions affecting junior colleges and normal schools.

"The following statement of standards for junior colleges is made with clear recognition of the fact that organizations so designated are still in their experimental stage both as to the type of work to be included and as to the correlation of such work with that of high school on one hand and with that of standard colleges and technological and professional schools on the other. The definition is based on the assumption that the junior college is an integral part of a large system and that its standards and courses should facilitate interchange of students and credits between the junior colleges and other higher educational institutions.

"The junior college is an institution of higher education which gives two years of work equivalent in prerequisites, scope, and thoroughness to the work done in the first two years of a college as defined elsewhere by this Committee.

"The Committee recommends.....the following standards and principles which should be observed in accrediting junior colleges:

"The requirement for admission should be the satisfactory completion of a four-year course of study in a secondary school approved by a recognized accrediting agency or the equivalent of such a course of study. The major portion of the secondary school course of study accepted for admission should be definitely correlated with the curriculum to which the student is admitted.

"Requirements for graduation should be based on the satisfactory completion of 30 year-hours or 60 semester-hours of work corresponding in grade to that given in the freshman and sophomore years of standard colleges and universities. In addition to the above quantitative requirements each institution should adopt qualitative standards suited to its individual conditions..."

Other provisions too extended to be quoted here deal with teaching staff, curriculum, equipment, finances, etc.

"The normal schools or teachers colleges are institutions of higher education with two-year, three-year, or four-year curricula designed to afford such general and technical education as will fit students to teach in elementary and secondary schools.

"The requirement for admission should be the satisfactory completion of a four-year course of study in a secondary school approved by a recognized accrediting agency or the equivalent of such a course of study.

"The minimum requirement for a diploma should be the satisfactory completion of 60 semester hours of credit (or the equivalent in term-hours, quarter-hours, points, majors or courses) and the minimum requirement for graduation with the baccalaureate degree—the satisfactory completion of 120 semester-hours of credit (or the equivalent in term-hours, points, majors or courses)."

Other provisions deal with curriculum, faculty, income, buildings and equipment, etc.

"The accrediting of standard colleges and universities as institutions for the technical training of teachers should be based upon meeting the following minimum requirements, in addition to com-

pliance with the requirements for standard colleges and universities as to admission, graduation, training and schedule of faculty, and size of classes:

(a) At least one full-time professor devoting himself exclusively to courses in education.

(b) Adequate facilities for practice teaching and observation.

(c) Adequate provision in the library for technical books and periodicals on education.

(d) Such a formulated curriculum or announcement of courses in education as will duly emphasize the technical character of the preparation for teaching."

The full report is contained in the *Educational Record* for July, 1924, which may be obtained on application to the Council, 26 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.

DAVID ALLAN ROBERTSON, professor of English at the University of Chicago, has been appointed Assistant Director of the American Council on Education to develop the work of the Council in the field of international educational relations. In cooperation with the Institute of International Education, the committee on the American University Union, and numerous other agencies operating in this field, he will devote his entire time to formulation of effective foreign policies and simplification of administrative machinery for their realization.

AMERICAN UNIVERSITY UNION IN EUROPE.—The following notes are taken from the report of the Director of the Continental Division, (Professor Algernon Coleman of the University of Chicago) for the year 1923-24: "During the year from March, 1923, to March, 1924, more than three thousand Americans have registered with the Union or in educational institutions of France for a study period of at least two months. This total includes 1400 men and 1600 women. The 1800 in higher institutions include 429 in the University of Paris, 132 in other institutions in Paris, the remainder in provincial universities; 46 were candidates for the doctorate. By far the largest group is interested in the French language and literature. The Director expresses the earnest hope that American academic authorities, especially heads of Romance languages departments, will give more personal attention to the projects of students who definitely plan to do advanced work abroad in Romance languages and litera-

tures. If such persons come to Europe with suitable training and a sufficiently definite conception of the task, their stay will be of great value to themselves and to American scholarship. Otherwise they may easily fail to reap substantial benefit from their opportunities for foreign study." Referring to the responsibility imposed upon the Director by the presence of such a considerable number of American students in France, involving the double functions of diplomatic representative of American education and of dean of American students in France, the following interesting comment is made: "The obligations in the former rôle are already fairly well determined; what the Director makes of the latter function is a wholly individual question. If, however, the number of cases of waste effort by American students is to be reduced, it can be done only by an effort on the part of a competent American specialist to know the difficulties that inevitably appear in a transfer from the American to the French system, and to arrive at a solution for them in each individual case. This would involve a deliberate attempt by the Director early in the academic year to meet, at least, all students planning to do graduate work, and to give those who need it definite information on the basis of which they may select institutions, instructors, and courses. Since, as was indicated above, most Americans take studies in French language and literature and since the Director is himself usually a specialist in this field, the acquisition of the necessary information and the establishment of the necessary contacts will constitute no formidable nor irksome task...

"It is appropriate in this connection to call attention to the possibilities of mutually profitable cooperation of the Union with the American Students' Association, an organization founded during the academic year now closing, of which all American students may become members. The retiring Director recommends, therefore, to his successors the importance of enlarging and completing in the various fields this body of information, and of calling very definitely to the attention of advanced students the excellent opportunities for directed study and for contacts with representative French life that are offered in certain provincial university centers. He considers that each Director should visit four or five of those that offer most attractions to American students, should make the acquaintance of those in residence and of the professors who direct their studies...

"The elections of May 11, 1924, brought into power another party

with different views on education. One cannot yet say just what modification will be made in the Bérard program. It is highly probable, however, that other principles will prevail; that Latin and Greek will no longer be obligatory as they were in the Bérard plan, that an effort will be made to work out a new program based on a full recognition of the value of the 'humanités modernes,' and to make the secondary system more democratic by doing away with certain obstacles that now exist to the passage by pupils from the primary to the secondary schools.

"The officers of the Union have been watching with much interest the operation of the Foreign Study Plan of the University of Delaware. As this project was presented at some length in the *Educational Record* for 1924 by President Hullihen, it is sufficient to say here that the first year's experiment has been conducted with apparent success.

"As a preface to their work in France, this group attended the summer course of the University of Nancy in 1923, where the new group for 1924-25 is now following in their steps, and pursued during the winter the studies of the '*Cours de Civilisation Française*' of the University of Paris. In addition they took systematic private lessons in French throughout their stay. The subjects studied were not, to be sure, the same as those they would have had in the college curriculum at home, and it is necessary to reserve judgment on the plan in general. It is, however, being carried out with prudence and a keen sense of the realities involved, and it would be exceedingly interesting if other American colleges would examine what is being done and would join in giving the project a thorough testing.

"The Director was invited by the Secretary of the Committee on Intellectual Cooperation of the League of Nations to attend its meeting in Paris, December 3-7 inclusive, in view, particularly, of a plan to establish at Geneva an International University Information Bureau. In consequence of this, the retiring Director attended two meetings of the council in Geneva, took part in securing material for the *Bulletin*, of which three issues have now appeared, and attended, as substitute for Professor Millikan, a meeting of the University Sub-Committee in Brussels. He considers this one of the most interesting and enlightening episodes of his stay in Europe, and hopes that his successor, if the presence of an American on the Council is still desired, will find it no less stimulating."

Professor H. C. Lancaster of Johns Hopkins has been appointed Director of the Continental Division for 1924-25.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS. COMMITTEE ON INTELLECTUAL COOPERATION.—The Committee has recently begun the publication of the *Bulletin* of the International University Information Office, the program of which reads in part as follows:

"The International University Information Office, which is now publishing its first *Bulletin*, is starting on modest lines as befits an entirely new institution entrusted with an important and difficult work.

"It should at once be explained that the object of the Office is not to furnish the public of different nations with information of every kind regarding higher educational establishments throughout the world. It would, of course, be highly desirable that the Office should be able to perform that duty; but the resources at its command are too limited...

"The special sphere of the Office is that of international university activity. The interchange of professors and students, of books, and of ideas, between universities of different nations is by no means a new development. University life in its medieval beginnings was international; it is only in modern times, by a natural and inevitable tendency, which accompanied the formation of nations and states, that universities have become nationalized. But the period which historians call 'modern' is one which we have already left behind us. Though far from abandoning their rôle as national institutions, the universities have been seeking, during the last twenty or thirty years, to draw closer together in spite of the frontiers which divided them. This tendency has been forced on them by the progress of science, which demands an ever-closer cooperation between nations, and by the development of certain branches of study which are strictly international in character. In short, they have been carried along by the great world movement for international organization, which may be described as the distinguishing feature of the twentieth century.

"As an outcome of this tendency, recent years have witnessed the spontaneous development of every form of international university life; students of all classes are leaving their countries by thousands to complete their studies abroad; professors are going in hundreds every year to occupy the chairs of foreign colleagues. Numerous

administrative measures have already been taken by Governments and universities to facilitate visits of foreigners; these measures include equivalence of curricula, equivalence of degrees, traveling grants and scholarships, regulations for exchanges, exemption from lecture fees, and special courses for foreign students.

"Nevertheless, we are still only witnessing the birth of an organization which we trust will produce great results in assisting the studies and moral education of the youth of this generation and the next and in the preparation of men's minds for international concord and world peace. In no sphere does national sentiment rise to greater heights than in the domain of higher research; yet it is in this very domain, if its growth be carefully watched, that it offers itself most advantageously to the understanding of other nations, and that it can most easily attain that high level at which love of country and love of humanity are no longer found in conflict.

"University organization has to face many difficulties. In the Middle Ages universities were few; today we count them by hundreds, scattered over all the continents. They speak in more than thirty tongues, they reflect the most varied types of civilization. It is no easy task, among all these institutions in every quarter of the globe, to organize communications which will enable them to multiply their connections and to obtain thereby all the advantages which people in every country have a right to expect.

"This work is beyond the powers of the International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation or its University Office. Its accomplishment depends in the first place on the good-will and initiative of the universities themselves, or of the states to which they belong. But the International Office can cooperate very effectively by making a synopsis of all the facts connected with international university work. That is the first part of its program. It believes that it can count on the goodwill of the institutions of every country; for it is unquestionably desirable, and even necessary that there should exist some office which will record with care all the various aspects and developments of a better understanding between peoples in higher education...

"The League of Nations has agreed to administer the International Office and to publish its *Bulletin*, but it wishes it to proceed on modest lines. The situation, however, demands that the work should have a wider scope than that of mere statisticians or purveyors of infor-

mation. The Office will be in a position to study new schemes for international university cooperation, to make suggestions based on technical knowledge and to encourage contact between institutions and countries, where contact in the field has not hitherto existed—in short, to organize propaganda in favor of international university cooperation.

"We have described the work as important. We shall give no details here of the staff and the means at the disposal of the Office. Both are small, but not too small to produce results. The Committee on Intellectual Cooperation has appointed a committee to supervise the work consisting of a few individuals representing the principal language and civilization groups. The main object of the International University Information Office and its *Bulletin* is to encourage cooperation. May it at once secure for the institution the sympathy and the goodwill of university men in every country and of all who are interested in the progress of science and of higher education!"

The contents of the double number, January-April, 1924, also include a report on the Organization of the International University Information Office, on a Conference with representatives of Students' International Associations, on Organization of Exchange of Students, on Conditions of Life of Students Abroad, and interesting communications from different countries and institutions. An appendix gives a list of National Committees on Intellectual Cooperation and suggestions relative to the organization of such committees. The July *Bulletin* contains a discussion of proposals of the Spanish Government regarding the Establishment of an International University and on the question of the Equivalence of Diplomas. Other topics under the general head of Inter-University Relations are: Exchange of Professors, Exchange of Students, Equivalent Recognition of Academic Studies and Degrees, Courses of Lectures on Modern Nations, Teaching of Modern Languages, Literatures and Civilization, International Vacation Courses. The use of scientific films for university teaching is also considered.

The Secretary of our Association had the pleasure of personal conference with the editor of the new *Bulletin* and anticipates good results from future cooperation.

COMMITTEES

NEW CHAIRMEN AND MEMBERS.—The following chairmen and committee members have been appointed: additional member of Committee B (Methods of Appointment and Promotion), R. J. Bonner (Greek), Chicago; Committee M (Freedom of Teaching in Science), *Chairman*, S. J. Holmes (Zoology), California; additional members: J. H. Breasted (Oriental Languages), Chicago; R. F. Griggs (Botany), George Washington; R. A. Millikan (Physics), Calif. Inst. Tech.; *Chairman*, Committee S (Emeritus Membership), A. C. Armstrong (Philos.), Wesleyan.

COMMITTEE A, ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE, REORGANIZATION.—With a view of facilitating the work of the Committee in dealing with problems that arise in different parts of the country, three divisions have been formed—the Eastern, including: F. A. Fetter (Econ.), Princeton; J. P. Lichtenberger (Sociol.), Pennsylvania; A. O. Lovejoy (Philos.), Johns Hopkins; E. S. Thurston (Law), Yale; A. L. Wheeler (Latin), Bryn Mawr. The Central: H. M. Bates (Law), Michigan; F. S. Deibler (Econ.), Northwestern; H. F. Goodrich (Law), Michigan; F. R. Lillie (Zool.), Chicago; G. L. Roberts (Educ.), Purdue; U. G. Weatherly (Sociol.), Indiana. Western: G. P. Adams (Philos.), California; H. R. Fairclough (Latin), Stanford; F. M. Padelford (Eng.), Washington (Seattle); R. C. Tolman (Chem.), Calif. Inst. Tech.; H. B. Torrey (Biol.), Oregon.

Questions of general policy will come to the whole Committee, or its Chairman, Professor Goodrich, as heretofore.

UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE.—The report published in the April *Bulletin* has aroused much discussion with radically divergent views. Some of the criticisms of the report have been the subject of attention on the part of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure and of the Council. Further comment on the situation is anticipated, and probably a further authoritative statement of the attitude of the Association on some of the principles involved. It seems worth while at this time to reprint the following editorial from *The New Republic*, with two letters subsequently addressed to that journal.

A Professorial Fiasco

"The case of the University of Tennessee has exposed the vital weakness of the Association of University Professors as educational

policemen. Here is an institution which last July summarily dismissed seven professors. The Association was naturally called in to exercise whatever power it has to mobilize public opinion by investigation and publication of the facts. But it turns out that it has become so rigidly committed to the scrutiny only of technical legal points of tenure and prerogative that it is now, apparently, automatically limited to infractions of the professorial code. It happens that this university makes a practice of appointing its staff for only a year at a time. To drop a man it has only to withhold appointment. When, as in this case, it elects to give him a 'hearing,' all the established properties have been complied with. The teeth of the investigating body have been drawn in advance. The worst that can ensue, under the precedents, is an ineffective snap at the 'undesirable' system of year to year appointment.

"The public, of course, is not interested in piddling points of law, with the standards of etiquette of the committee on academic freedom and tenure. What has happened? it asks. Is the ship being lightened of bilge, or has the cargo been jettisoned?

"On this, the essential point, the report of the university professors maintains a discreet, perhaps an impotent silence. Under the rules the investigation centers in the treatment of the plaintiffs, who therefore find themselves, doubtless with considerable surprise and chagrin, the real object of investigation. The effect of this is to exclude the character and conduct of the administration, the real defendant, from examination. What were the authorities of the University of Tennessee driving at? One can gather only so much as may be read between the lines of this report, the April issue of the *Bulletin* of the Association.

"What one gathers is suspicious enough to make the short-comings of the investigation still more exasperating. Of these seven teachers, one, a professor of education, was dropped because he was not a good 'whooper-up.' The man who holds his job must be a 'go-getter' among secondary schools. Side kick at his teaching of evolution *via* Robinson's 'Mind in the Making.' Scholarship and teaching power unquestioned. The second, a woman teacher of art, was dismissed for lack of cooperation. Her interest was art, and she had, by general admission, developed student interest in art to an unprecedented degree. But 'the university was obliged to consider the fine arts as more or less of a luxury' (the Dean), and she was asked to cooperate

in the 'applied art' of dress-making, it being claimed that she was engaged upon such an understanding. Nervous and emotional, and did not cooperate suitably with the applied artists. These two alone received advance notice of impending doom.

"Their warning, in April, created a stir that proved fatal to several others. The third, a well-known zoologist, was dismissed because he was intemperately devoted to his work, persistently overdrawing his laboratory allowance and omitting in his zeal for science to act as time-clock for the students. Also and particularly, he took the field against the administration in behalf of number one, gave out indiscreet interviews and invited the present investigation. The fourth, a professor of Latin, was also disagreeably zealous in pursuit of his intellectual interests. He writes extensively and had built up a strong classical tradition in the university; but his teaching was 'erratic and injudicious.' The authorities felt 'that his work should be confined mainly to Latin translation and that literature and art should be left to the departments to which they properly belonged,' and he, no doubt, wondered what departments those could be if not his own. Also held improper views on Debs and the Peace Treaty, and protested at the first case above.

"The fifth, psychologist, failed to cooperate, *i.e.*, to allow the professor of education (not number one above) to appoint men to teach sections in psychology who were not qualified to teach the subject. (One of these, a middle aged man, seems to have been presented with a bachelor's degree and an appointment to the faculty by the department of education 'for work he never actually did.' Also protested at number one's dismissal. The sixth, the premedical dean, 'engaged in agitation' to alter the constitutional organization of the university. He seems not to have been an outstanding scholar; but he was apparently motivated in his efforts at reorganization by a genuine desire to improve the situation and began, admittedly, with the approval of the president. But he was 'indiscreet' to a reporter.

"The seventh was a professor of law, uniquely influential among the students, but also uniquely immoral in his professional conduct. The law students and alumni were practically unanimous in his praise. His instruction was most highly valued. His services to the university in the past had been quite unexampled. But he cut his classes. He treated the most serious examinations lightly. His grades were a farce. (This distinguished him from his colleagues at

the University of Tennessee.) He failed to do penance with the absence sheets. He (one shudders to record it)—he smoked in the university buildings. All these things were specified and proved against him by his dean. Not specified but present even to the view of the committee was a sharp disagreement between dean and professor as to methods of teaching law, the dean standing for the Harvard system. Perhaps the professor was a personality rather than an intellect. Evidence fails on this point.

"Here, then, is the picture of the administration which is, properly, under investigation. The bill of indictment which is indicated might be drawn as follows. The University of Tennessee prefers go-getting growth to scholarship. Where intellectual and vocational interests conflict, it advances the vocational. Its conception of scholarship is narrow and conventional, and its theory of teaching pettifoggery to the last degree. It has an inferiority complex that makes criticism intolerable. Upon the evidence of this report one can only conclude that a timorous and unenlightened administration has thrown out some of its strongest men because it could not stand their disapproval, and has done so without suffering more than a perfunctory slap on the wrist from the one body in America which it should justly fear in such a crisis.

"By drawing such a picture the committee has allowed itself to be hopelessly caught. Either the picture is false, in which case the university has cause for grave complaint, or it is true, in which case the plaintiffs have been 'done in.' Indeed, the most disquieting suggestion that comes from the printed record is that the Association of University Professors is interested not in universities nor in the individual victim of injustice but in the professorial caste. That caste is defined not by excellence of scholarship or teaching but by rules of tenure. Consequently considerations of educational quality must be excluded from the examination of a university. Throughout the report these professors reprove their injured colleagues for 'a certain want of tact,' and 'inability to work harmoniously with their superiors under an organization which they disapproved,'—as if they were office boys under a head clerk with an ugly temper. What should be the attitude of a group of scholars under an administration intent upon educational suicide? What is the attitude of the Association toward such an administration? What if it is committing hari-kari with the utmost decorum and most accomplished tact? We have

yet to learn. There is no Committee on Academic Competence."

The New Republic, May 28, 1924.

Oct. 6, 1924

EDITORS OF THE NEW REPUBLIC,
421 WEST 21 STREET,
NEW YORK, N. Y.

DEAR SIR:

The review, published under the caption "A Professorial Fiasco" in *The New Republic* of May 28, on the report of a committee of the American Association of University Professors on the dismissal of seven professors from the University of Tennessee, rests in some of its essential parts on a serious misconception of the functions of the Association which has led *The New Republic* to an erroneous if inadvertent interpretation of the attitude of the committee.

The objects of the Association are stated in the constitution as follows: "To facilitate a more effective cooperation among teachers and investigators in universities and colleges and in professional schools of similar grade for the promotion of the interests of higher education and research, and in general to increase the usefulness and advance the standards and ideals of the profession."

The Association is a professional organization similar to the American Bar Association and the American Medical Association.

The function of the Association is to lead the way in raising our colleges and universities to the highest levels of efficiency in the diffusion and promotion of knowledge for the intellectual and material welfare of mankind. To this end its activities cover a vast field, which it has but begun to invade. When the foundations of an institution are shaken, as in the case of the University of Tennessee, it is important, as *The New Republic* insists, to know what it all means. To this end the Association undertakes to establish and publish the facts, with the cooperation of the faculty and of the administration. Neither is investigated in a prejudicial sense. We have no quarrel with administrations. The facts should speak for themselves. *The New Republic's* terse indictment of the policies of the University of Tennessee disproves the charge that the report lacked the information to which the public is entitled. Even if *The New Republic* had to read between the lines, it evidently did not find it difficult to interpret the facts.

A little further reading of the lines of the report, not between them, I hope will convince *The New Republic* that the Association does not grant that an institution can avoid its obligations of considerate treatment of an individual professor by pleading its policy of making appointments only from year to year, although it may have the law on its side. Universities are the nurseries of ethics, not of technicalities.

It is difficult to reconcile *The New Republic's* statement that the Association is interested not in universities, etc., but in the professorial caste, as defined only by rules of tenure with the fact that the Association is constantly investigating problems relating to the high mission of institutions of learning, etc., as set forth in its constitution and that it has published notable contributions in this field.

The Tennessee report is the report of a Committee. It was published for the information of the members of the Association and of the public, and will be considered at the annual meeting of the Association at Washington, D. C.

We welcome criticism and appreciate the interest shown by *The New Republic* in educational matters.

Very sincerely yours,

A. O. LEUSCHNER, *President*,

TO THE EDITOR OF *The New Republic*,

SIR:

May I be permitted to comment briefly on the editorial article "A Professorial Fiasco" in *The New Republic* for May 28 devoted chiefly to criticism of a report by a committee of the American Association of University Professors on certain dismissals of teachers at the University of Tennessee?

For the most part the article is an unusually diverting example of the popular literary *genre* known as a self-contradiction. It declares first that "the report maintains a discreet, perhaps an impotent, silence" on the essential question as to "what has happened. Is the (Tennessee) ship being lightened of bilge, or has the cargo been jettisoned?" The editorial writer then proceeds to draw from the report a somewhat circumstantial account of "what has happened," and sums up thus: "Upon the evidence of this report one can only conclude that a timorous and unenlightened administration has thrown out some of its strongest men because it could not stand their

disapproval." An "impotent silence" which can reveal so much is surely also an uncommonly eloquent silence. What the editorial writer apparently fails to understand is that the primary and essential duty of a committee of inquiry is to ascertain and publish the facts; and that the Association has always had a good deal of faith in the antiseptic potency of mere facts carefully established and plainly set forth. The committee (of which I am not a member) has, in this case, as a matter of public service and professional loyalty, given a great amount of unpleasant and unremunerated labor to collecting precisely the detailed evidence of which *The New Republic* makes use in the picture of conditions in the University of Tennessee; and the fairly certain effect of the disclosures made is that few university teachers able to obtain employment anywhere else will be disposed to accept calls to that institution so long as its present methods and standards continue. It is mainly in this way that the Association exercises such functions of an "educational policeman" as it has undertaken. It lays before its members the concrete information necessary to enable them to judge for themselves concerning the character of an institution and the desirability and professional propriety of serving in it. The same information enables the general organs of opinion to make such comment as they deem appropriate. That *The New Republic* has in this instance commented vigorously on the Tennessee situation is a matter for satisfaction; but that it shows even more zeal for lambasting the policeman than the offenders strikes one as a little odd. Is not, perhaps, the lambasting habit becoming a trifle too confirmed and promiscuous in *The New Republic* office?

Certain statements in the editorial can only be described as misleading. It asserts, for example, that the Association "apparently" takes the view that when a university "elects, as in this case, to give a man a 'hearing' all the established proprieties have been complied with. The teeth of the investigating body have been drawn in advance." The Association has never taken such a view, nor can anything of the sort be inferred from the report. That "hearings" had been given, or offered, was known in advance; the very fact, therefore, that an investigating committee was nevertheless appointed shows that that formality was not regarded as conclusive evidence that "all the established proprieties had been complied with." Your editorial writer is apparently unable to distinguish between the

proposition that a certain procedure is requisite and the proposition that it is sufficient. It is, again, asserted that the report indicates that, in the opinion of the Association, "considerations of educational quality must be excluded from the examination of an institution." This must refer either to the "educational quality" of the whole institution or to that of the professors dismissed. The committee was not appointed to conduct a general educational survey of the University—a task which, even if called for, would have been almost impossible for a voluntary committee of men able to give only their hours of nominal leisure to the inquiry. Upon the "educational quality" of each of the teachers concerned—except where the evidence was found to be conflicting and inconclusive—and upon the educational standards of the administrative officers, the report presents abundant information—sufficient, at least, to enable *The New Republic* to conclude that among those dismissed were "some of the University's strongest men."

That the report is beyond criticism I do not suggest. The committee in its desire to be just to that side in the controversy to which it might be conceived to be antecedently unfavorable, has, I think, leaned backward too far; it has made too much of dubiously extenuating circumstances and sometimes misconceived where the burden of proof should lie. Yet it must be borne in mind that these investigations are not *ex parte* but judicial in intent; their efficacy essentially depends upon their scrupulous fairness and accuracy. A few reports resembling in logic and style *The New Republic's* editorial would speedily destroy the Association's usefulness as an "educational policeman." It is, however, also true, in my opinion, that—the facts once impartially established—the committee would have done well to disengage more sharply the major from the minor issues involved in the case and to restate much more vigorously, with respect to the former, the principles for which the Association stands. There is much in the report from which I should myself dissent. But this primarily fact-finding report was not to be the Association's last word on the subject—as your editorial writer was in a position easily to ascertain.

ARTHUR O. LOVEJOY.

LOCAL AND CHAPTER NOTES

CALIFORNIA CHAPTER. LETTER IN REGARD TO THE AMERICAN COUNCIL REGISTER.—“The American Council on Education was organized in 1918 by representatives of the Association of American Universities, the American Association of University Professors, and other national societies. It is now engaged in preparing a Directory of College and University Teachers, which will present a fairly complete record of facts concerning the training, experience, and general educational contributions of the persons indicated. It will be classified by subjects of instruction. The purpose of the Directory is to serve as a trustworthy source of information about the living academic men and women of the United States and to provide an impersonal means of advancement for those who are available for transfer.

“You will soon receive from the American Council of Education a personnel blank asking information about yourself for use in this Directory. You are urged to contribute to the success of the Directory by promptly filling out and returning the blank and asking your colleagues to do likewise.”

P. B. FAY, *Secretary*.

Similar cooperation by other chapters is to be desired.

CHICAGO. THE INDIVIDUAL UNDERGRADUATE AND THE COLLEGE COMMUNITY.—“A very notable step in the direction of the treatment of students as individuals was taken last year in the work of the Committee on Selective Admission and Retention, of which Professor Morrison was chairman. The admission blanks prepared by this committee call not only for the conventional and necessary statistical information, but go on to ask such questions as these: ‘What are your favorite amusements?’ ‘How have your recent vacation periods been spent?’ ‘If you have a *hobby*, what is it?’ ‘What magazines and newspapers do you regularly read?’ ‘Of all the things you have accomplished, which have given you the greatest personal satisfaction?’ In each case, moreover, the student is asked to write a brief autobiography.

“The blanks as filled out are human documents of surpassing interest. They tell of childhood in many parts of the new world and the old; of environments now favorable, now difficult; of a wide

variety of enthusiasms, of struggles, and of successes. They read as though they were—and indeed some of them surely are—first chapters in the autobiographies of great men and women.

"Before registration this autumn each registering dean was given an opportunity to read the blanks of the students he was to register and it thus became possible for the dean to greet the student with a friendly knowledge of his experience in school days.

"The success of these blanks at once suggests the desirability of a personnel record of a more human type for the college years. It is our hope that such a record may before long be devised.

"A second step in the same direction was taken last summer by President Burton in the enlargement of the staff of College deans. There are now ten deans in the Colleges as against five a year ago; and the number of students assigned to each dean has thus been reduced to about two hundred and fifty. This number is still too large—but even so the registration interviews have been of a much less mechanical and more human type than heretofore. The acquaintances thus begun should grow more and more effective from quarter to quarter, for the plan is that so far as possible each student shall throughout his course be assigned to the same dean who welcomed him as a Freshman.

"A third step, taken in the autumn, is the beginning of a study of methods of special care and encouragement for the leading students. It has been too frequently the case in the past that instructors and administrative officers have spent so much time and energy in keeping the poorer student up to the mark that they have had very little left for the leading students. Yet the group of leading students comprises nearly all of those who hold greatest promise of making real contributions to the welfare of society—by thought, by life, by creation, or by discovery—and the highest service the college can render to society would seem to be in the fullest development of the potential leadership of such men and women.

"We are experimenting with various types of care and encouragement for them, and have reason to hope that the experiments are already meeting with some measure of success. Some of the larger classes have this autumn been sectioned on the basis of ability, thus giving to each student a chance to work at the highest level of his capacity and interest. Several instructors have given privileges and exemptions of various sorts to the leading students; and the deans

have given them the very practical advantage of priority in registration for the Winter Quarter.

"Be it known, however, that we do not identify the 'leading student' with 'the student of highest scholastic standing'—but are seeking a definition which shall be a rightly proportioned and wisely selective expansion of this tentative statement:

"A leading student is one who possesses in notable degree many qualities which promise growth and attainment in leadership—such qualities, for instance, as attractiveness in personality, technical ability, accuracy of observation, intellectual curiosity, power of initiative, ability to reason, purposefulness, love of one's fellows."

E. H. Wilkins in *University Record*.

IOWA STATE COLLEGE.—The Local Chapter reports a Faculty Committee on Student English, with the following assignment of duties:

To raise the standards of written and spoken English throughout the College.

To give the students a realization of the importance of clear and correct English in all lines of college work.

To encourage and, if necessary, insist upon a continued improvement in the students' use of English throughout the college course.

To insure that all graduates have an accurate working knowledge of the language.

The Chapter also reports its second annual banquet to honor those seniors and juniors who have achieved high standing in scholarship and other activities.

NORTHWESTERN. IDEALS AND AIMS OF THE COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS.—During the past academic year the Chapter has given serious study to the problem of formulating the aims of a college of liberal arts. The following are extracts from the report of its committee:

"The purpose of the College of Liberal Arts is to give to properly prepared students who have the requisite ability and energy such training and knowledge as will fit them for high service in the world and will give them resources for happiness in their own lives. The college endeavors to liberate them from narrowness of outlook and inexact habits of thought; to stimulate them to the maximum of self-culture—to a full and harmonious development of their tastes and powers; and to awaken in them a sense of loyalty to some high purpose in life.

"To achieve this end, the college undertakes to orient its students in the world about them—the physical universe, the world of society, the world of ideas and artistic forms; to aid them in relating the world of the present to that of the past and of the future; to enrich and discipline their tastes; to train them in habits of clear, vigorous, and accurate reasoning; and to set before them high standards of conduct and achievement.

"More specifically, the College of Liberal Arts endeavors so to direct and develop its students as to

(1) Cultivate in them a respect for the things of the mind and inspire them with a desire to know, with an eager and intelligent curiosity which will act as a stimulus to an increasingly broad and vital intellectual life;

(2) Familiarize them with the chief instruments and methods of effective intellectual work;

(3) Enable them to lay a broad and solid foundation of organized and connected knowledge of the physical world in which they live and of man—his nature and behavior as an individual and his relations and activities in society; the forces by which his existence and progress are conditioned; the institutions he has developed; the great ideas that have moulded his thought; his most significant traditions and achievements; his noblest creations in literature and art;

(4) Urge them to the attainment of a scientific attitude of mind, the habit of formulating judgments only after a critical and methodical scrutiny of the facts;

(5) Aid them to acquire some measure of taste, which will manifest itself both in a generous-minded response to what is fit and appropriate—a developing power of appreciating beauty and excellence in literature, art, and life—and in a discriminating exercise of the various modes of self-expression.

(6) Inspire them with a desire to render effective, intelligent, and disinterested service to society.

"In a word, the primary purpose of the College of Liberal Arts is not to provide specialized technical or vocational training to fit its students into positions immediately after graduation or into narrow niches of the present-day social structure, but to produce men and women who, in thought, taste, and conduct, have become liberal-minded, tolerant, self-reliant, independent, and who will find themselves at home in the world in which they live.

"Four years is little enough time in which the College of Liberal Arts may hope to perform its vital function of enabling its students to gain that knowledge, sympathy, and breadth of vision which are necessary for the enrichment of leisure hours, for successful partici-

pation in affairs, and for high and unselfish citizenship. Moreover, if the real purpose of the College is not to be thwarted, training of narrowly professional or purely utilitarian character can find but little if any place in the undergraduate program of study; this program must be reserved for courses conceived and taught in accordance with the aims which have been here defined. The College of Liberal Arts must, therefore, insist upon four full years of its students' time in order that they may lay a firm foundation for broad, deep, and humane culture."

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA AND OHIO WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY.
—Both these Chapters report dinners with Ex-President J. V. Denney as guest of honor and speaker.

RECENT EDUCATIONAL DISCUSSION

TENURES IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES.—"A committee on tenures to consider revision of the existing practice of Swarthmore College in this field was appointed recently by President Frank Aydelotte. Finding very little definite information available on the subject, a letter of inquiry was sent out to which replies have been received from thirty-five institutions. . .

"The principle of selection followed was severely practical, the aim being to include the representative larger universities of the east, and a considerable number of colleges of about the same size as Swarthmore, particularly those located in Pennsylvania. At the time there was no thought of covering the country as a whole nor of making anything more than a local application of the results. . .

Instructors and Assistants.—It is the general rule to appoint instructors and assistants for terms of one year only. In five of the thirty-five institutions it is apparently possible to appoint instructors for longer periods, the most extended terms mentioned in this connection being three and five years.

"Only two of the thirty-five institutions—and these among the smallest in the list—extend the policy of one-year appointments to all ranks in the faculty, including full professors. In both cases, however 'it is understood that after the first year's service a man is practically a fixture unless something very unforeseen happens.'

Assistant and Associate Professors.—The general rule regarding assistant and associate professors is appointment for terms in excess of one year, usually two to three years for assistant professors, three to five years for associate professors. Five only of the thirty-five institutions—all ranking among the smaller colleges—appoint assistant professors for one-year terms. In eight other institutions initial appointments to such positions may be made for one year, subsequent appointments being for longer periods. Reappointment, especially if made more than once, carries with it a strong presumption of permanence. A few of the larger institutions specify not only the length of term but the number of reappointments, the understanding apparently being that promotion (or dismissal?) occurs at the end of the series.

"It is a striking fact that permanent or indefinite tenure, recognized as the rule for full professors, is being extended by several institutions to associate professors as well. This is true of Columbia, Harvard,

Pennsylvania, Princeton, Brown, Bryn Mawr, Colgate, Rutgers and Smith. In at least two cases assistant professors also may receive permanent appointments.

"Professors.—Twenty of the thirty-five institutions, including all the larger institutions with one exception, state that the tenure of full professors is indefinite or permanent. In the one exceptional case just mentioned and in one other smaller institution appointment of professors is at the pleasure of the board of trustees, but permanence is stated to be the rule. Probably the same reservation regarding the power of the trustees exists, whether stated or implied, in most of the institutions under consideration. Three colleges not covered by the foregoing statements make initial appointments to professorships for terms of three years. Still another states that 'after five annual appointments a professor may be elected for three years, and then for an indefinite time, subject to removal only for cause.' While not always stated, it may be assumed that indefinite tenures cease at the age fixed for retirement.

"From the administrative viewpoint annual tenures possess the advantage—a dubious one, at best—that men may be dropped from the service without question at the end of any college year. From the professor's point of view annual tenures have the advantage of enabling him to go, also without question, at the end of any year upon acceptance of a better offer. At times the latter is a very real advantage. However, it can be safeguarded under longer or permanent tenures by rules requiring definite notice sufficiently in advance of resignation. One of the worst consequences of annual tenure for professors of higher rank, even when accompanied, as it usually is, by substantial permanence, is a certain sense of indignity which makes for restlessness. No matter how conscious the professor may be of the likelihood of continuous employment he feels himself treated as a casual laborer. Other things being equal, there is of course no doubt that of two offers of academic position, one annual, the other for a long term or permanent, it is the latter which would be preferred.

"Form of Tenure Regulations.—For the most part, regulations regarding tenure resemble the British constitution in that they are mere understandings or customs. This is particularly true of the smaller institutions. That they are generally observed, that, as we have already noted, a high degree of permanence is attained even with annual appointments, may also be conceded. A few of the letters

received in response to the Swarthmore inquiry express the opinion that custom is to be preferred to formal rules in this field. 'We have tried many times,' writes the president of a New England institution, 'to impose a definite tenure upon the different grades in our teaching staff, but we have feared to put the university in a strait-jacket. My experience is that when the administration tells a young man that his work is unsatisfactory and that promotion is not for him, he wants to go, and the matter can be arranged just as easily without a definite tenure as with it. . . . Because of our fear of the strait-jacket we have no rules or regulations on this subject. . . . Where there is sympathy, confidence and understanding, few rules are needed. Where there is not, no rules will avail.'

"According to the 'plan for the government of the college,' the Bryn Mawr rules regarding tenure, which because of their fullness and detail deserve special mention, are as follows:

" 'Professors shall be appointed for indefinite terms, except in the case of the appointments of professors not previously connected with the college, in which case the initial appointment shall be for three years, and if renewed shall be for an indefinite term.

" 'Associate professors shall be appointed for terms of three years until after the third appointment, when the appointment shall be for an indefinite term.

" 'Associates shall be appointed for terms of two years or more.

" 'Other officers of instruction shall be appointed for terms of one year or more.

" 'The foregoing appointments shall, respectively, cease at the expiration of the several terms agreed upon, but notice of reappointment or non-reappointment shall be given in writing by the president of the college in case of associate professors in the first term of appointment, associates and those of lower rank on or before the first day of March of the year in which the appointment terminates, and in case of a professor or associate professor after the first term of appointment on or before March 1st of the year preceding that in which the appointment terminates; in the event of a decision by the directors not to continue the appointment of or to remove a professor or associate professor leave of absence at the option of the board may be given to such professor or associate professor by the directors, with full salary for one year. All appointments are subject to regulations covering the retiring age.

" 'Professors and associate professors appointed for indefinite terms shall be removed only after a conference between the committee on appointments, and a committee of five directors, at which conference the president of the college shall preside, and only after a written report of the findings of said conference shall be made to the board of directors for consideration and action by it. All teachers of the above groups shall be entitled to have the charges against them stated in writing and to have a fair hearing on the charges before this conference before its findings are reached.' "

"At Dartmouth a number of propositions similar in general content to the Bryn Mawr rules were adopted by the board of trustees and faculty, June 4, 1917. However, these propositions are distinguished by a frank recognition of the principle of mutual obligation in matters of tenure. Thus the Dartmouth trustees and faculty agree that 'there is a mutual equity in this matter, and that members of the faculty recognize a moral obligation not to ask release under circumstances detrimental to the best interests of the college without affording reasonable time for the college to make necessary readjustments.' Further, in connection with the provision for a faculty advisory committee to consult with the president in matters of appointments and reappointments, the trustees 'call attention to the occasional need, for the good of the service, that a member of the faculty shall be demoted, or even dismissed; and would wish to have the endorsement of the faculty upon the proposition that, to the extent that this committee is given participation in the policies having to do with the advancement of members of the faculty, in like manner it shall share responsibility in the occasional perplexing problems connected with inefficient service or non-ability to make their work of advantage to the college.' "

"So far as the Swarthmore inquiry goes the Bryn Mawr and Dartmouth rules represent the highest achievements yet recorded in this field of college legislation. These two actual enactments may well be compared with the ideal formulation of measures stated, in 1922, by the Committee on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure of the American Association of University Professors as desirable in order 'to render the profession more attractive to men of high ability and strong personality.' "

"In connection with permanent tenure the question has been raised: Why should the professor ask to be safeguarded in a manner not

common to other professions or in business? The most obvious rejoinder is that under such a system the university would promptly lose its best men to business. Further 'to subject the teacher and scholar to all the risks of the world of competitive enterprise, while withholding from him the chance of its larger pecuniary rewards, is illogical and unfair, and its entire tendency is to dissuade men of ability from entering the academic profession.' . . .

"Moreover, it must not be forgotten that long or even life terms are a common feature of the civil service, of official positions in the army, navy and higher courts, and of other branches of public service in the most successful administrative establishments of the world. With such illustrations before us it is futile to argue that the professor who desires a certain security of tenure is asking to be safeguarded in a manner not common to other professions or in business."

ROBERT C. BROOKS in *School and Society*.

OUR UNIVERSITIES.—"The higher education of America is today controlled by big business. This came about very naturally through the well-meaning attempts of the graduates of our colleges to keep their several alma maters abreast of the times in numbers, equipment and prestige. . .

"It was, of course, always necessary that the money should be spent under the eye, as it were, of the givers, and by persons whom they approved. Philanthropists are apt to put their benevolences in the charge of men who resemble themselves. Hence the gradual substitution of business men for scholars on the managing boards of our universities.

"Another feature of the case was this, that many able presidents and trustees of colleges, men of scholarly attainments, were turned by the pressure of the times into mere business administrators, while the public still conceived of them as educators.

"Behind this phenomenal outcome of our social conditions there lies an unsuspected principle, which is, nevertheless, very plain when one once thinks of it. Men who give money to a project of which they know they are ignorant will trust the experts. They will trust the astronomer to build an observatory, or the scientist a laboratory. They will put millions in charge of doctors for the equipping of hospitals. But, unfortunately, such is human nature that every man thinks he knows something about the higher education, and hence

it is that our higher education shows the ravages wrought by ignorant wealth and is now in a state of rags and remnants. It has almost no friends, no champions, no spokesmen. The stillness that reigns in the academic world while the house of learning is being torn down and removed like rubbish—or like the tinsel show of a past age—is the worst sign of the time.

"Who shall speak for the higher education? Its professors? They have been so disciplined that they almost believe that nature made their office a humble one and that, far from being protagonists, they must peep about and impart their all but lost enthusiasms to a few wandering students who find their way to them. They hope that the curriculum may allow them to do this; but their hope is dim. . . .

"If there be truth in this analysis, it is certain that the truth will soon be understood by many, and we may then expect that a great discovery will be made, and we shall find that salvation is not so far off after all. The important fact is that the humanities and the intellectual enthusiasms of life do not need expensive foundations. The researches of science do need them and our facilities in these fields have been richly provided through the wisdom of the donors. . . .

"So far as the classics, literature, poetry, languages, history, are concerned, a youth can get a better entry into all these fields of thought through early contact with the mind and nature of a few scholars than by resorting to a caravanserai where the lettered persons are scattered and oppressed and where every distraction glares upon the youth and lassoes him on his path toward learning. . . .

"There is many a boy whose whole future has been saved by a timely rustication. The history of talent shows that men are influenced by a few important contacts with one or two superior minds. This much is all they can digest and all they need. But for such contacts quietude is essential. A house in the country and a few pupils; leisure for thought; hard work; bodily exercise—and much conversation; these were the historic practices out of which learning has arisen in every age. They give the pupil of genius a chance to develop, and they give the born teacher, of which there are many, a chance to use his gift. Involved as he is at present in the cruel machinery of pretentious schedules, the teacher of talent is one of the persons most to be pitied in our commonwealth.

"The true academy, whether school or college, has no need of marble porches and electric bells. Not only had it better start small; but

it must start small. Any form of imposed organization will stifle it. Advertising and brag will annihilate it. It must spring up out of a spiritual impulse in a few men. Those who give it money must give and vanish, leaving those whose spirit created the place to guide its destinies.

"Will not our people discover so simple a path to the old cultivations as is here suggested? I think they will. They will not, perhaps, have a theory about the matter, but they will grope toward a conclusion. They will discover that learning must be directed by learning. The next step beyond this will be—and I expect to live to see it—that some of our business men will come to treat education as they have treated science. Schools and colleges will be endowed which are to be directed solely by scholars. The substance of education, not its organization, its parades, its parchments will be honored.

"The greatest enemy to intellect is over-organization, whether in religion, politics or education; and all the defects of our universities from which they seem to be dying are due to over-organization. Now it happens that in the matter of general cultivation—that field, namely, in which America is weakest—the best results can be obtained, and have always been obtained, by a minimum of organization. The influence of brain upon brain and character upon character is what counts."

J. J. CHAPMAN, in *School and Society*.

THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY AND SOME OF ITS FOES.—"As the institution grows in influence and helpfulness, it is more and more beset by certain annoying groups which want to turn its momentum to their own purposes. These I may define as the Pharisee, the Philistine and the charlatan.

"The Pharisee, interested in the promotion of some special ecclesiastical organization, would like to color instruction with his own hue. In freedom of thought, he finds the fountain of heresy, yet some sort of heresy lurks in every line of honest investigation. The university must not shrink from such charges, for its prime duty is to question everything; there is no other way to 'hold fast that which is good.' Its true function is that of umpire, not advocate. The aim is not to provide students with 'sound opinions' on any question of religion or politics. Ready-made opinion is merely prejudice. To be

of value in the conduct of life, convictions must have a deeper root....

"A great teacher the Pharisee can neither understand nor support. But, however annoying his efforts, he is a serious obstruction only locally, and for the time being. In the larger movements of life he is left behind and forgotten. . . .

"The Philistine, in one way or another, would make the college useful in his business. He cares little for theory, less for abstract truth, but is interested in 'results.' If the university is a 'huge factory for turning out a standardized intellectual product,' he would like to see that product of a type helpful in his affairs. The college should look after this matter, he holds, if he is going to help pay for it, as he knows from experience he will be called on to do. Of liberalism he approves in case it be not too liberal, a fine asset so long as it helps his interests.

"But rich men, even rich trustees, are by no means necessarily Philistines. In the American college or university, financial control rests in the hands of a board of trustees, control of education in the faculty of instruction, with a president as spokesman and leading member. This system works perfectly in theory and fairly well in practice, when the distinction is properly observed. The board of trustees, having chiefly business functions, is naturally made up of men successful in finance. Business looks toward immediate measurable ends and not toward idealism or research. Hence arises a tendency of some boards to encroach on academic functions, usually, though not always, to their disadvantage. But the great majority of college trustees, the country over, try sincerely to further the best interests of their institutions. During the period of political hysteria from which we are now barely convalescing, temptation to meddle was unduly great.

"The weakest feature in the present system lies in the fact that competent executives are rare, and boards of trustees seldom know how to find them. Nevertheless, as all our institutions are 'going concerns,' their educational development requires a coordinating policy, centered in some one person. To trust even academic management to a committee of professors has never worked well, because committees deal with the present and compromise as regards the future.

"The college president has three main functions. Educationally, he should look at least ten years ahead; he should be himself a scholar,

because he must know and weigh scholarship in order to make wise choice of professors; thirdly, he must keep in sympathy with his colleagues, and in close touch with their students, encourage them in wisdom and learning by showing how these virtues look when they are lived. . . .

"Men who meet such conditions are rare, as already observed. Trustees are likely to prefer one who can raise money, who can make speeches, who is socially 'clubable,' whose name is often in the press—matters alien to real academic needs. . . .

"In the fact that our institutions do not yet form a system lies their best hope for the future. Each hopes and expects to mark yearly advance. In some quarters the ideals are low—buildings, numbers, athletic victories. In every case, the pull of tradition and the impulse to go with the crowd are often strong, even to the point of discouragement. Nevertheless, 'the world does move,' and each year the dictum of Lord Bryce becomes more and more pertinent; 'there is nothing in America of which she boasts less, and nothing of which she has a greater right to be proud than her universities.' "

D. S. JORDAN, in *School and Society*.

THE CONTENT OF A LIBERAL EDUCATION.¹—"As a consequence of these new methods and ideals there have arisen problems in social and political organization that have no counterpart in history and differ from anything contemplated in the old humanities and classical studies. They are in fact *new humanities*, and who shall say they are not as important as any that have gone before? Is the study of the tremendous changes now taking place in our social and political fabric, with its complex components of socialism, single tax, equal suffrage, universal education, industrial legislation and regulation, compulsory sanitation, and the great economic considerations resulting therefrom, less important to humanity, physically, mentally and morally, than a study of ancient forms and dogmas that have no bearing on present-day existence? Most certainly they are not, if we judge these matters by the standards which we laid down in the beginning. These are things that are of vital interest to all men and the study of which is truly liberalizing; they are real humanities, and the older humanities and classical studies will survive only as they can be interpreted to assist in these new problems or inspire men to higher planes of thought and action.

¹ Address delivered before the Association of Land Grant Colleges.

"The humanities are not, as some would have us believe, matters that belong to a distant past. They *flow* in an unbroken stream from our experiences with life. There is not, nor can there be, any stopping point for this flood. *The humanities have been, they are, they will be*, and, of a necessity, they will contain in times to come many things undreamed of in the past. The test of excellence is application; and as men measure all older forms of recorded experience and philosophy by the standard we have laid down, they very naturally, in accordance with the law of the survival of the fittest, discard those that are not helpful, just as they also lay aside outworn creeds, useless religious dogma and hollow outward form.

"What is needed is an interpretation of the older forms of recorded experience in terms of present-day problems—a new astronomy from the old stars. Uplifting influences must be active, not passive. This need has already been recognized and met in many subjects. History, for instance, is no longer a dry and dusty record of kings and their misdeeds; it has been vitalized greatly by drawing from it conclusions that may guide us in our present needs. The church in all progressive countries has recognized that, if it is to save the souls of men, it must take increasing cognizance of temporal conditions; and scholars of the finest type may be helpful in present-day problems. This is the kind of scholarly work that is worth while. At no time in the history of man has help of this kind been so much needed. The outcome of the social and political changes of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries is more pregnant for good or evil to all humanity than that of any other period of history, and posterity will study these changes with far greater interest than we of today study the story of the French Revolution or the Fall of Rome. The practical application of this viewpoint is already well under way. The problem of securing a liberalizing content in engineering curricula, for instance, has long been a difficult problem for educators. Slowly this content begins to appear from out the nebulous mass of experiment and speculation. Any comprehensive account of this development is beyond the limitations of this discussion, but it may be of interest to note that this liberalizing content appears to be mainly *economic* and *historic*; economic in so far as it will enable the engineer to understand modern industrial problems and historic in so far as it may help him to visualize the problems to humanity and the contribution his profession may make toward their solution.

"In all probability, furthermore, this content will be secured without adding to the length of the curriculum, but rather by condensing and making more efficient the present courses of instruction so as to make more room for liberalizing studies. . .

"We hear men who are interested in so-called liberal studies deplore the fact that students in other branches are lacking in what, to them, seem to be essentials of liberal training. Men in these other branches make similar remarks regarding students in these same so-called liberal studies; and both are probably right.

"The great majority of college students, men and women, in all courses, are necessarily undeveloped mentally; and whether they eventually become liberally educated men and women depends on many things besides the particular studies they pursue in college. . . .

"Some men will become liberal-minded in spite of educational processes, while others, though they may never leave the atmosphere of liberal study, will give little promise of development along these lines. Men of genius arise in all lines most unexpectedly and from most unexpected sources; we have never been able to predict their coming or hasten their advent. Sometimes they sweep it impatiently aside, create new methods of their own, and change the map of their chosen field, not with our aid, but in spite of our methods.

"In a modified way this is true of all. Every man and every woman comes into the world possessed of certain potentialities, no two bringing the same combination. The best we may do is to provide facilities to assist each one to develop the characteristics that are desirable and to suppress those that are undesirable. We can give them such instruction, in a narrow way, as will help them to become self-sustaining citizens and may perhaps, as they pass down the somewhat narrow corridor of the university curriculum, open up such side doors as will give them some idea of the great problems of human existence with all its hopes and fears, and some glimpse at least of liberal training. In a democracy, that takes cognizance of all, this means an educational system so broad that it will include all movements looking to universal betterment and must necessarily include many things that formerly were not considered important in educational work. . .

"Above all let us keep an open mind in all things educational. *He is most liberally educated who has the most comprehensive grasp of man's vital problems and sympathy therewith.* Let us not forget the

object of all educational methods as conceived by the present-day democracy and as we have already defined it, for it differs radically from any that have gone before. . .

DEXTER S. KIMBALL, in the *Educational Record*.

TENDENCIES IN PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION.¹—"One thing the foreign student must surely note which some of us are inclined to overlook—that is, that university education is rapidly becoming professional education. As far as the facts are revealed by statistics, it appears that we now have a score or more of well-recognized professions where only a few years ago there were but three or four. It is evident that longer periods of time are being devoted to training for the older professions and that year by year the training periods for the newer professions are being extended. It appears also that the professional divisions of universities and the independent professional schools not included in university organizations enroll an overwhelming majority of the students who are now receiving higher education. . .

"Twenty-five years ago it was quite the other way. University education, so-called, was chiefly college education, liberal training for nothing in particular. The professional schools were regarded as mere appendages to the universities. Those which were then comparatively new, such as schools of engineering and agriculture were held to be greatly inferior in dignity. Schools of law and medicine, although not the objects of social discrimination, were generally treated as stepchildren by the administration. Their welfare was not of equal concern with that of the college of arts and sciences. . .

"University administrators—and in that category I include presidents and secretaries, and deans and members of boards of trustees—are, with the rarest exceptions, products of the old régime, graduates of colleges of arts and sciences, still under the spell of that romantic period of life which no one, thank heaven, ever quite outlives. The deans of professional schools and the presidents are, of course, forced to contrive ways to meet the exigent necessities of the professional division. But am I unfair in assuming that the majority of administrators fail to see the present picture of university education in its true perspective? Is it unjust to say that the complicated and

¹ Address delivered before the Association of Urban Universities.

constantly shifting problems of professional training have received relatively little attention? . . .

"From every point of view the standardizing of medical education at the hands of the American Medical Association is the most successful and the most beneficent of all the standardizing enterprises. But let us note some of the evil effects which even this enterprise has had.

"Any standards have to be defined in objective terms, or else they are hard to defend. What purely objective measures can one apply to an educational institution? Thus far we have devised only one kind. The only measures we can use are quantitative and material. We can count the number of persons employed by an institution for full or for half time. We can count the number of hours spent on this subject and on that, the number of years devoted to this or to that phase of training. We can count the income which a certain endowment fund will produce. We can combine all these counting operations in a series of paragraphs and define one of them as units, another as semester hours, another as income from productive funds and so on, and out of it all comes a standard. Practically all the standards now applied to educational institutions are of this order. But does any intelligent person believe that human efficiency can be accurately measured in this way? Does any one believe that institutions, which are, like human beings, organic, developing, variable, can in the long run be stimulated by a process so mechanical? . . .

"Very evidently the standardizing of professional education is not going to stop with the three or four professions that have thus far actively engaged in it. It is on this account that I believe it is worth while for the universities now to take the whole situation under review. Indeed, they must soon speak or forever after hold their peace.

"Every administrator in this gathering knows that the pressure exerted by the dictum of a national standardizing agency on any individual institution is absolutely irresistible. Literally, a professional school cannot survive if it meets the disapproval of a strong standardizing body. If, therefore, one of these professional standardizing agencies—which, you will remember, is backed by the organized opinion of the profession—should choose to say what shall be taught, the university would probably follow the prescription. Thus far the standardizing bodies have with admirable wisdom and self-restraint refrained from designating the content of courses of instruction. There is a single exception. It lies in the field of

medical education. The Council on Medical Education has not prescribed the curriculum of medical schools, although it has made certain recommendations bearing upon it, but it has prescribed in considerable detail what shall be taught during the two years of the pre-medical course in colleges of arts and sciences. Probably the inclusion in the pre-medical curriculum of each one of the elements which compose it can easily be justified. Nevertheless, I think its prescription was a great mistake. If time permitted, I believe I could argue the proposition that the content of the pre-medical curriculum could be vastly improved. But that is not the point to which I wish to direct your attention. What I would emphasize is the fact that a professional body outside the university has usurped the function of the university in defining a course of study. Moreover, the course of study it has prescribed is not in the professional school but in a division of the university with the problems and purposes of which the professional advisers cannot be familiar. One is tempted to wonder whether this fact may not have made the prescription easier. But however that may be, the precedent established by the American Medical Association in this respect gives grounds for apprehension. Neither the lawyers nor the dentists have yet attempted to say anything more than that there shall be one or two years of college work as a preliminary to professional study in law or dentistry. But signs are not wanting that when their respective classifying enterprises are further advanced, either or both of them may hand down from Mount Sinai the perfect pre-professional curriculum, which the colleges will then be respectfully requested to accept.

"Let me summarize my estimate of the virtues and defects of the standardizing movement in professional education. There must be standards, as objective as possible, to protect the public against bogus institutions and to stimulate and tone up professional education. Published classifications of professional schools are the most effective device for eliminating or improving the unfit. As long as standardizing bodies recognize that their definitions and classifications are necessarily only partial, good is likely to result from their activities. On the other hand, standardization of professional education is fraught with great dangers. The dangers threaten both the professional schools and those divisions of the educational system devoted to preparatory training. The most serious danger is that

the action of standardizing bodies is likely to be followed by the enactment of statutes or the promulgation of regulations governing preparation for professional licenses. Such statutes and regulations tend to freeze professional education into the form which it has at the time of their adoption, and so to defeat progress. The standardization of medical education furnishes an example which may turn out to have important effects. It has led certain other professions to imitate the medical procedure and to copy the requirements set up for medical schools without sufficient inquiry as to whether these are necessary for or appropriate to training for other professions. The prescription of the pre-medical curriculum was a mistake. The prescription by other professional bodies of the content of pre-professional education may be expected, unless the universities take steps to prevent it. Such prescription, particularly when it is reinforced by law, represents about the worst calamity that can happen to collegiate and secondary education at the present moment.

"The country is on the verge of a wholesale readjustment of secondary and higher liberal education. A redistribution of teaching materials and functions as between the secondary school and the college is generally recognized to be necessary and everywhere impends. Any professional requirements which tend to crystallize the existing organization in colleges and secondary schools will greatly retard this readjustment. . .

"My own view of the matter is that the determination of the content of professional training should be a joint undertaking. It ought to be carried on cooperatively by the universities and by the national organizations of the several professions—and I include pre-professional education as a part of professional training. Definitions of the content of professional training should concern themselves only with the content of an irreducible minimum. They should allow—and again I include the pre-professional field—the widest freedom for experimentation. No one is now satisfied with the training provided for any profession. The proceedings of the great professional associations are annually filled with lamentations. Thoughtful members of the lay public have also long been critical. The only remedy thus far attempted has been the piling up of time requirements; and this has not effected a cure. It is important that new devices be invented and tested. It is still more important that new principles be applied—new principles both of psychology and of pedagogy. Unless the

professional schools are accorded greater freedom than is now granted them by certain of the regulating bodies, they cannot play their part in developing these new devices and principles. It is apparent that the intimate cooperation of the professional associations and the schools which I advocate has not existed in every professional field. But it can easily be secured. The necessary organs exist. Whenever the universities are ready, they can secure it through the American Council on Education, which is the agency they have themselves created to serve them in large cooperative undertakings." . . .

S. P. CAPEN, in the *Educational Record*.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY CONCERNING CLARK UNIVERSITY

The present report differs in its occasion and, in part, in its purpose from those previously submitted by committees of inquiry of this Association. Such committees have hitherto in all cases been appointed by the Association's general Committee on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure (Committee A); and their reports have dealt either wholly or primarily with questions of tenure or freedom of teaching. The present committee has been created, not by Committee A, but by the Executive Committee of the Association (1923); and the case before it involves no alleged violation of the legitimate freedom of utterance of university teachers, nor any complaint of dismissal for improper reasons or in violation of contract. Requests for an inquiry were, however, made, on what were asserted to be not less serious grounds, by individual members of the Association in the spring of 1923; and in the autumn of the same year a formal collective petition for an investigation, stating specific charges, was submitted by one professor and three former professors of Clark University, Dr. C. A. Kraus, Dr. H. E. Barnes, Dr. E. G. Boring, and Dr. F. H. Hankins. This petition is subjoined to the report (Appendix A).

Under these circumstances it is perhaps advisable that the committee of inquiry should begin by stating its understanding of the reasons for this innovation in the practice of the Association. The committee hopes that it will not misinterpret the views of the Executive Committee or the Council, but it can, of course, speak only for itself. Whether the Executive Committee would have authorized a special report if it had had before it only the above-mentioned requests, this committee cannot judge; but there were in fact certain other pertinent circumstances which may reasonably have contributed to the decision. Charges against the administration of Clark University, emanating chiefly from recent members of its faculty and from its alumni, had already received the widest publicity, and have continued up to the time of preparation of this report; and the question of the truth of these published charges could hardly be a matter of indifference to any one interested in the fortunes of distinctively university (as contrasted with undergraduate) work in the United States. Clark University has had a

special and distinguished part in the development of such work in this country; and what in general was alleged was that the University, in the language of one of its oldest and best-known alumni, was being "ruined" by maladministration. More than forty graduates of the University, for the most part professors in other institutions, have signed public statements declaring that the scientific reputation and educational efficiency of Clark were being rapidly impaired and calling upon the trustees to remove the president.¹ In addition certain specific breaches of faith on the part of the trustees and president have been alleged. To these charges several replies have been made by the president of the University and the chairman of the Board of Trustees; and perhaps to most of the educational profession it has been difficult to judge of the facts, in the vehement and involved public controversy that has been going on.

It has seemed desirable, therefore, that in a situation so unusual an impartial inquiry, by persons in no degree involved in any local dispute, should be undertaken, to determine what has been in fact occurring at Clark University during the past four years—and, if possible, why it has been occurring. The results of such an inquiry should be of interest to the alumni of Clark, who are largely represented in this Association, and to all other friends of the University; they may possibly be of service to the future historian of higher education in America; and the recent history of this one institution may perhaps contain something of instruction for officers and teachers in other universities.

In order that its report may, if possible, contribute to these ends, the committee thinks it inadvisable to present merely a pronouncement upon the validity of the several charges formally laid before it by the complainants. While the committee's findings concerning these will be indicated in due course, it seems to the committee more useful to attempt primarily the rôle of the historian. It will therefore try chiefly to narrate accurately and to analyze the general course of events at Clark University since 1920, and to render in some degree intelligible the causes of the circumstances recorded. The committee regrets that such a purpose is hardly compatible with great brevity. Moreover, the committee believes it to be desirable to lay before those interested sufficient evidential material to enable them to form their own conclusions on the main issues.

¹ See Appendix E.

In the course of the controversy to which the case has given rise certain charges and recriminations concerning the motives and animus of the principal parties to it have been uttered; with these the committee has not dealt, believing them to be immaterial and irrelevant to the issues upon which it was appointed to report.

In the preparation of the report the chairman of the Committee has made three visits to Worcester and had interviews with President Atwood, with three members of the Board of Trustees, with twelve members of the faculty of Clark University, and with other persons; and another member of the committee has talked with the chairman of the Board. The Committee desires to acknowledge the courtesy of all those who have placed at its disposal sources of pertinent information. The chairman has also had long conversations with President Atwood elsewhere, and with Professors Boring and Kraus, of the complainants. The larger part of the evidence, however, consists of numerous written statements and replies to questions, and of original documents, together with material already printed in local and other publications, all of which has been examined by all members of the Committee.

I. ORGANIZATION OF CLARK UNIVERSITY BEFORE 1920

Clark University was opened in 1889. From 1902 to 1920 two institutions created by the same founder, Clark University and Clark College, with a single board of trustees, but with two presidents and separate endowments, occupied grounds and buildings in common. The president of the University, Dr. G. Stanley Hall, was also head of a department (psychology) and gave probably the greater part of his time to his departmental activities. The University and the College supported separate departments in most subjects, though there was a measure of cooperation between them in some cases. The University had an exceptional position among American institutions as one of the very few devoted specifically to the promotion of research and to exclusively post-graduate instruction; it was probably, until recently, the only one possessing an independent and inalienable endowment for this purpose. Its income, however, was at no time sufficient to maintain departments in all the subjects usually recognized in the organization of universities. In 1920 there were eight departments: mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology, psychology, pedagogy,

sociology, history and international relations. The last two were relatively recent additions; the heads of these two university departments were also heads of the corresponding departments in the College, so that the cost of maintenance in these two instances fell partly upon the College treasury. The total University teaching and research staff in 1920 numbered 23, of whom eleven were professors.

The Board of Trustees was (and is) a small one, consisting of nine members, of whom the chairman (Dr. C. H. Thurber, editorial member of the publishing house of Ginn and Company, with whom the present president of the University was then associated in the publication of the Frye-Atwood series of geographies) was a graduate of the University, and another, the secretary, was a graduate of the College. Both were elected to these offices shortly before the beginning of the incidents recorded in this report. The president of the University alone, according to By-Law II, had "power to select and appoint all officers of instruction, subject to the approval of the Board of Trustees;" and was (By-Law III) "the medium of communication between the Trustees and instructors, individually and collectively, upon all matters within the field of action of either body." To these provisions adopted at the beginning of the University later regulations had added a measure of faculty participation in the government of the University; in particular the Senate, consisting of the president and all full professors, was authorized to "determine the general policy of the University in all matters pertaining to instruction and research, and to approve all appointments to the teaching staff for a term of more than one year, and also all promotions."¹

II. ELECTION OF NEW PRESIDENT AND ADOPTION OF "NEW POLICY"

In 1919, after thirty years' service, Dr. Hall, the first president of the University, announced his intention of resigning at the end of the academic year. At the same time Dr. Edmund C. Sanford, president of Clark College, "feeling" (as he states) "that the time was opportune for the union of the College and University under a single administration, to the great advantage of both, also asked to be permitted to return to professorial work, thus leaving the

¹ Register, 1920.

field free for any re-organization of the joint institutions which the trustees might think wise to make." It was thus evident, Dr. Sanford observes, "that one chapter of the history of the institution had ended and that a new one must be begun." At this juncture the trustees were compelled to face certain facts concerning the general situation in the United States with respect to facilities for graduate study, and concerning the condition of Clark University.

These facts have been summed up by Dr. Sanford as follows:

Graduate teaching is of all sorts of teaching the most expensive, and while the funds available in the great institutions had been growing enormously, at Clark they had been practically stationary for more than twenty years—indeed had recently been cut in half in purchasing power by the rise in prices. More money wisely expended means better facilities for study, and better facilities mean more students coming to take advantage of them. It was inevitable therefore that Clark should find herself distanced both in facilities and in students by those whom at the start she had led and with whom she had even later been able to compete on equal terms. Except in Dr. Hall's own department where the lustre of his individual name still attracted students, and in chemistry, where conditions were somewhat exceptional, it was doubtful how long any students at all would forego the attractions of the richer institutions for the close personal contact of student and professor which was the chief advantage Clark had now to offer.¹

Dr. Sanford has gone so far as to describe the situation as "desperate." The difficulty was doubtless partly due to the fact that several departments—though conducted by distinguished scholars—were literally or virtually "one-man departments," whereas other universities had relatively numerous staffs of teachers in the same subjects. The total enrollment of regular graduate students in the 1920 Register was 75, the largest department having 18 students, the smallest five. The majority of these were in receipt of some form of stipend.

The possible ways of dealing with this situation, as they presented themselves to the minds of the trustees and their advisors in the spring of 1920, have been set forth by Dr. Sanford in these terms:

Three obvious courses were open: (1) An effort might be made to raise more funds for endowment; but against this, at least as an immediate solution, was the fact that Clark has no wealthy alumni and the further fact that the time was most inopportune for an endowment campaign. (2) The fight might be given up and university work be allowed to lapse as rapidly as obligations to individual students and professors could be fulfilled. Against this was the un-

¹ "A Sketch of the History of Clark University." *Publications of the Clark University Library*, January, 1923.

willingness of all who knew the struggle and heroic endeavor that had gone into the earlier salvaging of the university and the value of its accomplishments to give up the fight without at least one more genuine effort to keep alive and in action its spirit and ideals. (3) The third course was to shorten sail, to reduce the number of departments to such limits that those remaining could be financed with the funds available. A fourth possibility, related to the third but not quite so obvious was to find some new field, one which the richer universities had not yet entered upon, one which might bear to present conditions somewhat the same relation that was borne to conditions a generation ago by psychology and pedagogy, when Dr. Hall made them prominent at Clark. An incompletely endowed university can compete with larger and richer institutions if it has something new and significant to offer. Such a plan necessarily involves a more drastic cutting of existing departments than the third, but, on the other hand, it applies the institutional funds in a way which is likely to bring the greatest return for the money expended.

The fourth plan was not immediately adopted by the trustees; they at first attempted to continue the policy of combining the presidency with the headship of the department of psychology, and of making that department the principal one in the University. The dual office—which included the headship of Clark College,¹ since its union with the University had been decided upon—was offered to two eminent psychologists, but was by them declined. Whether either would have accepted the professorship without the presidency is not known to the committee; in any case the trustees—for no sufficient reason, in the committee's opinion—assumed that the headship of the principal scientific department and the administrative responsibility for the whole institution should be united. Failing, therefore, to obtain a psychologist-president of their choice, the trustees—according to the statement of Dr. Sanford and of the chairman of the Board, Dr. Thurber—turned to the fourth plan above mentioned. They determined to create a new department, or rather school, devoted to geography, a subject in which opportunities for advanced work were relatively scanty in the United States, and especially in the East; and they called to the presidency and to the headship of the contemplated new department a distinguished and enthusiastic specialist in that subject, Dr. W. W. Atwood, then a professor in the department of geology in Harvard University.

The reasons actuating the trustees in this decision, though not

¹ The term "University" in this report, except where otherwise indicated by the context, will refer to the postgraduate departments of the institution after as well as before the amalgamation of Clark University and Clark College in 1920.

clearly made known at the time, have been retrospectively set forth by Dr. Thurber in a public statement issued in 1923. The committee cites the more essential passages in this statement as supplementing that of Dr. Sanford (see appendix D).

The total amount available to run Clark University, that is, the graduate school as distinct from the college, is about \$80,000 a year. . . . And yet university work must be maintained at Clark, for there is a separate endowment for that purpose which can be used for nothing else. No department in the University could be respectable unless a respectable salary could be paid to hold a first class man. What to do? Maintain a lot of graduate departments, cheaply manned, or concentrate on the few things that could be done well, centering so much of the work as possible about the good library? The choice was easy to make; it does not seem as though any one with good sense could question it. . . . Nobody has been dismissed, but certain graduate departments that had declined were not revived. The future at Clark holds few departments, but these are to be such as to add lustre to the University and enlarge its service to the world.

Dr. Thurber further mentions as a reason for the choice of geography and kindred subjects as the fields in which the work of the University was to be concentrated, that the library was not only well equipped but had an independent endowment; while the "departments of natural science require large expenditures for laboratory work and this money could come only from the general university fund. Concentration on departments that were already provided for as to material supplies was just common sense."

President Atwood, however, has given the committee a different account of the nature of the new policy and its financial implications and consequences. In a letter to the Chairman he writes:

When I came to Clark it was believed that the savings resulting from the reorganization in the administration of the University would cover the greater part of the cost of the Department of Geography, and that has proved to be the case. No change in the organization of the other departments has in any way benefited the budget of the School of Geography. It is perfectly true that when I accepted the presidency of the University no arrangement had been entered into with the Trustees of the University or with any other body looking to the abandonment or dropping of the work in any of the older departments.

The committee is unable to reconcile these assertions, taken in the sense which they would naturally be understood to convey, either with the published statements of Dr. Thurber and Dr. Sanford, or with the reports of the Treasurer of the University, copies of which for the period from Sept. 1, 1919 to August 31, 1923 are

before the committee. (1) The addition of a new department with no definite purpose of discontinuing any existing department would not constitute a policy of concentration, such as has been outlined by Dr. Thurber; it would constitute a policy of expansion. Dr. Thurber's statement plainly represents the new policy of the trustees as determined from the first by the view that "departments of natural science requiring large expenditures for laboratory work" could not be advantageously maintained at Clark and should, as opportunity arose, be dropped. (2) It is not the case that "savings resulting from the reorganization of the administrative work of the University have covered the greater part of the cost of the department of geography." The cost of "University" administration for the year 1919-20, the last year before the assumption of office by President Atwood, was \$4,313; for 1922-23, it was \$5,270, while the cost of the university department of geography was \$16,454. The average cost of administration (University) for the three years ending Sept. 1, 1923, was \$4,603, of geography \$11,000. In short, there has been no reduction, but an increase, in administrative costs, so far as the University is concerned; and even if such costs had been entirely eliminated, the saving would have covered only a small part of the expense of the new department. In the joint cost of administration of University and College some economies have been effected, but they are insufficient to cover half the total cost of the department of geography. Nor can such savings ever have been reasonably expected to maintain the "greater part" of the work of that department. In the budget for 1921-22, the first prepared during Dr. Atwood's administration, the sum of \$25,000, or more than 40% of the departmental appropriations, was allotted to geography (though not spent). It can hardly be supposed that the trustees expected to save more than \$12,500 out of a total administrative expenditure of \$4,313—or even of \$12,587 (College and University combined). (3) It is not the case that "no change in the organization of the other departments has in any way benefited the budget of the School of Geography." The total expenditures for University departments for 1919-20 were, in round figures, \$56,000; for 1922-23, \$54,000. Of the latter sum, \$16,454 was spent on the department of geography, leaving about \$38,000 for other departments, a reduction of about \$18,000 in the expenditure for non-geographical subjects since 1920. It is true that in the

past four years sums more than sufficient to provide for the work in geography have been drawn from the unexpended balance accumulated up to 1919; but these drafts on reserves have been absorbed by the item of general, non-departmental "Expense," which has doubled since 1920. The Treasurer's reports thus show no other source for the expenditures on geography than the general fund which it shares with the other departments; and they show that these expenditures, now amounting to over 30% of total department costs, have been made possible only by corresponding reductions in the sums devoted to other departments.

On the last two points, then, President Atwood's testimony to the committee is misleading. On the first point the committee assumes the general correctness of the accounts given by Dr. Thurber and Dr. Sanford, and consequently the incorrectness of that of Dr. Atwood; *i.e.*, it assumes that the trustees in 1920 definitely intended to adopt a program, not simply of adding a new department, but of "concentrating" upon geography and related subjects, and that this obviously implied and was known to imply (in Dr. Sanford's phrase) "a drastic cutting of existing departments." This assumption appears to the committee to be conclusively confirmed by statements made by Dr. Atwood himself and by others at his inauguration (see below, V), and by the fact that in the opening year of his administration two of the eight graduate departments were in fact discontinued when opportunity arose—in one case (biology) through the resignation of a professor, in the other (mathematics) through the retirement of two professors by reason of age and ill health.

III. DISCUSSION OF THE NEW POLICY

1. A policy of concentration was unquestionably a wise and, indeed, a virtually unavoidable one for Clark University, as for any other institution in similar circumstances. For continuing the *status quo*, *i.e.*, the existing number of departments with the existing scale of salaries, there was, in the committee's judgment, nothing to be said. The real question confronting those responsible for the University's policy was not whether to concentrate, but how to concentrate. Assuming that some further reduction of the number of subjects to be covered was necessary, should the concentration

be effected (1) by creating a new department and selecting for survival a few others in more or less related subjects, or (2) by materially strengthening one of the existing departments, and making it the centre of a small group of kindred departments to which the entire postgraduate work of the institution should be devoted? The arguments in favor of the former alternative have already been indicated in citations from Dr. Sanford and Dr. Thurber: the new department, if in a subject relatively neglected elsewhere, would enable Clark to make a more distinctive contribution to advanced instruction and to research, and would attract graduate students without involving competition with near-by and better-endowed institutions. These considerations were pertinent and serious. But the arguments in favor of the other alternative were weighty, and, so far as the committee has observed, they have never been set forth—though they involve principles of more than local application. A complete or almost complete breach of continuity in the life of an institution must obviously entail many disadvantages; there is a potent, though not necessarily an insuperable, presumption in favor of building upon foundations already laid, instead of tearing down and starting again on a new plan. Nor was a concentration upon one of the groups of disciplines already recognized at Clark University at all impossible. The related subjects of psychology and pedagogy, for example, had long been the chief specialty of Clark; the University's library and laboratory equipment in these subjects was exceptionally good; and a large number of distinguished graduates of these departments occupied important professorial chairs throughout the country, and would be naturally disposed to direct graduate students to Clark, if the subjects in question continued to be adequately provided for there. If to the previous expenditure on these subjects (over \$16,000 in the University, or about \$21,000 for University and College combined), the increase proposed for geography and related subjects by the new policy had been added, there is little doubt that, in spite of Dr. Hall's retirement, Clark University could in a few years have become one of the most important centers in America of advanced study and research in psychology and its application to education and to social problems. Or again, with a similar addition to its budget, an important and successful graduate department of mathematics could probably have been maintained. The sum

should have been sufficient to enable Clark to add to the staff of that department two or three mathematicians of the highest standing, and several younger men of promise; and the University already had in its service an eminent mathematical physicist. To mention one other possible alternative: the department of chemistry, though it had only one professor, was, next to psychology, the strongest in the University; with a similar increase of income it would probably, in conjunction with physics, have still further increased the number of its graduate students and the sum of its contribution to chemical research. It is clear, then, that concentration around one or two of the existing departments was entirely feasible and by no means unpromising; and that—whatever the other advantages of the alternative policy—the former would have given a desirable continuity to the development of the University, would not have alienated a great part of the alumni, especially those in the teaching profession, and would consequently have avoided most of the disturbances, and the injury to the reputation and “good will” of the University, which have resulted from the course actually adopted.

The committee feels obliged to mention also certain objections which might be made to the selection of geography as the new central department; these should be regarded as subject to whatever qualifications may be required by the fact that there is no geographer upon the committee. The objections in question imply no lack of appreciation of the interest and importance of this study; they arise, on the contrary, from its magnitude, the costliness of adequate facilities for advanced study and research in it, and its dependence upon related subjects not represented at Clark University. The word “geography” is obviously not unequivocal. So far as the committee can gather, the subjects covered by the term, in the plans of the trustees and president of Clark University, were chiefly four: (a) physiography, the study of present earth forms and of the processes by which they have arisen and are being modified; (b) “anthropogeography,” or human ecology, the study of the effects of environment and of geographical factors upon racial characters and cultures and historical movements; (c) economic geography, especially as a practical commercial subject; (d) the study of contemporary economic and social conditions in other countries. As defined by President Atwood in 1923,

The policy at present in the graduate department at Clark now centers about the study of the larger national and international questions. In the school of geography a group of experts will be at work in the study of the actual conditions in these foreign lands, the physical setting, the climate, the natural resources, including those that are being developed, and the potential resources of those lands, and the people, with their customs and traditions. The study of geography deals with the present, and man's adaptation to the environmental conditions within which he lives.

With these it was proposed to combine (e) the study of international relations and of the means of improving them. In his inaugural address President Atwood dwelt upon

the necessity for the American people to become cognizant of the resources and actual living conditions in the various parts of this country and informed as to the resources, the character of the people, their hopes and ideals, the actual living conditions in the other countries of the world. We must develop in the American people an international point of view. We have reached the stage when our future growth, perhaps our national existence, depends upon our judgment in dealing with the other peoples of the world.

Now of the phases of geography mentioned, the first is scarcely separable from general geology. In physiography Dr. Atwood is himself a specialist; but apart from this, there is no graduate department of geology at Clark. The second subject—anthropogeography—lies in an essentially different field from physiography, and it cannot adequately be studied in isolation from ethnography, historical anthropology, history (both ancient and modern, and especially of the Ancient East), and climatology. Clark possessed a department of modern history, but the other subjects mentioned were unrepresented. The competent study of economic geography (c) presupposes advanced training in economic theory, especially in the theory of foreign trade, and in statistical methods, and, as a commercial subject, is closely related to economic geology. And the study of the "hopes and ideals and of the actual living conditions of the people" in the other countries of the world would appear to involve a combination of economics, comparative politics, and the study of present-day social movements. Finally, the study of international relations is inseparable from that of international law, diplomatic history, and political philosophy—while, on the other hand, it is by no means closely connected with physiography.

Thus "geography," as officially defined in the enunciation of the plan of "concentration" at Clark was not only, in itself, a very

comprehensive subject; but also—unless certain branches of geographical study were to be carried on in isolation from other sciences to which they are intimately related—the new policy meant the addition of several other new departments of graduate instruction, not simply of a single department. Furthermore, proper graduate instruction and, still more, fruitful research in most of these branches of geography are by no means inexpensive. At the inauguration of President Atwood "the material means by which scientific geography may be best pursued" were set forth as follows by Dr. William Morris Davis, emeritus professor of geology in Harvard University:

There must be, in the first place, a good number of professors of geography, at least one for a continent, as well as instructors and assistants, laboratories and libraries. The professors must not spend all their time at their desks; they must be appointed on a plan which shall enable each one in rotation to spend a considerable fraction of his time, about one year in every five or six, away from the University, in his own special field of out-door research; and on his return he must not be at once plunged into administration or teaching, but must have a sufficient measure of free time to work up the results of his field study. Further, when he is sent out for explorations or research, he must not go on half pay; he ought to have double pay, for it is a great deal more expensive to carry on geographical work in Central Asia than in Worcester! If it is desired that the future professor of geography in Clark University shall do real geographical research, double his pay in those years when he is sent off to foreign lands; and on his return give him the fullest opportunity to write out his results. For the following year, he may have conferences with advanced students on special problems, but he should be largely free to make the best of what he went out to get.

As to students, do not wait until they have finished their graduate work before sending them into the field; but as soon as they have had fair preparation and have shown good capacity, give them the very best means of development by dispatching them to distant places where they must work largely alone, or perhaps in pairs, on new problems; provide them with sufficient means not for luxury but for success; let them remain six months at least, perhaps a year. Then when they come back again, see that they spend sufficient time in working up the results of their explorations, and let their reports serve as their theses for the doctorate. Do not accept for a thesis a little home problem, but demand a good large problem, the solution of which will test a student's mettle. A thesis prepared in this way should present a region or district of the world so clearly that others can see it for themselves.

President Atwood himself on the same occasion declared that:

It will be our policy to establish a school of geography . . . with a staff of experts who must become familiar with the geography of the different parts of the world; not entirely home-made experts, but experts who, by means of frequent

visits, active correspondence, and constant study of a given portion of the earth, keep up to date in their knowledge of conditions in the different countries . . . Field work is absolutely essential in the scientific study of geography. Our representatives must have a first-hand knowledge of the people whom they are studying . . . They must return from their laboratory studies with up-to-date information, ready with their pens, ready to teach, and ready to prepare new maps . . . We must look forward to developing for America a great bureau of information regarding the present conditions in this and distant lands.

For these studies, then, Dr. Atwood announced, the plans adopted by the trustees "if successfully carried out will lead to the development in Clark University of a department unique in America, and pre-eminent in its special field."

This seems to the committee an extremely interesting and attractive program; but it was an astonishing program for an institution compelled by financial limitations to adopt a policy of drastic retrenchment and concentration. Not many subjects, it is evident, would require larger expenditures than "geography" so conceived. And it is to be remembered that in this group of subjects—unlike psychology, chemistry, or mathematics—Clark University had almost no existing equipment. In short, then, in the interest of concentration the trustees—without additional endowment in hand or definitely in prospect—seem to have undertaken to carry out at Clark an ambitious program for which the University had no existing facilities, and to which its past development in no way pointed.

2. It is alleged by the complainants that, however great or small the intrinsic merits of the new policy, there was a special reason why so revolutionary a change was inadmissible at Clark. This reason, as stated in the complaint, is to be found in By-Law I, adopted in 1889 and printed for many years in the University Register, including that published in April, 1920. This By-Law contains the following provisions:

The President's first care and that of the authorities of the University shall be the departments already established, and next those closely related to them; but no other department shall be established until those already introduced have been brought to the highest state of efficiency then possible.

The "General Statement of Policy," issued at the opening of the University (but not, like the By-Laws, annually republished) contained a similar declaration.

It is, then, charged that the adoption of the new program in 1920—whereby a large part of the University income was diverted to a new department, certain of the old departments were discontinued, and others were reduced in efficiency—was a violation of this By-Law and therefore of a definite and public assurance which the trustees had given and upon which members of the faculty had relied. Professor C. A. Kraus testifies that this By-Law “was a very material factor” in retaining in the service of the University men who were primarily interested in research and the advancement of their respective sciences, and were therefore willing to remain on “salaries much lower than usually paid in other institutions for men of similar grade.” Because of this By-Law, he states, “the members of the old University faculty felt that there was every reason to believe that the income of the University was sufficient to care adequately for the departments then in existence, and that no other departments would be established until funds were available to care for the continued existence and development of the old departments. These men came to Clark or continued in their work at Clark under the impression that, provided they could demonstrate their ability to carry on the work for which they had been engaged, no difficulties would be placed in their path and that they would have the full support of the administration.” In entering, in the spring of 1920, into arrangements incompatible with this By-Law, without giving the faculty either prior notice that its repeal was under consideration or even prompt notice that it had been already disregarded, the Board of Trustees, Dr. Kraus asserts, “have been guilty of a breach of faith with their faculty.”

That the action taken by the Board was incompatible with By-Law I is evident. It is, however, the committee's opinion that the force of this charge is diminished, though not destroyed, by certain considerations to be mentioned. (a) The provision that “no other department shall be established until those already introduced have been brought to the highest state of efficiency then possible” was one which the Board of 1889 was ill-advised in adopting, if it be construed to mean that at no future time, under any change of circumstances, would the Board be at liberty to discontinue any of the original departments or introduce a new one. Such a change might even be required in the interest of some one or more of the existing departments, as a consequence of the progress of knowledge

and a resultant shifting of the inter-relations of the sciences. (b) The provision had not in fact always been literally observed before 1920. Through the courtesy of Professor Carl Murchison, the committee has been furnished a summary of the University's history in this respect (see Appendix C). Professor Murchison also calls attention to the fact that two of the complainants, "Doctors Barnes and Hankins, were members of the departments at Clark that were established in 1905 contrary to By-Law I. Neither of them could ever have been associated with Clark if By-Law I had been complied with by the old administration." The mere varying list of departments, however, as presented by Professor Murchison and President Atwood omits certain relevant circumstances with which they are doubtless unacquainted, and therefore conveys an erroneous impression of the facts. The new departments they mention were established only when, after 1904, the income of the University was considerably increased through bequests of the founder; and these additions in no case entailed the abolition of any existing department. Furthermore, most of the additions were only nominal; thus the establishment of pedagogy meant no extension of the University's work, but only the promotion to a full professorship of a teacher previously in the department of psychology. Anthropology was similarly added as essentially a strengthening of the work in psychology; it subsequently received independent development because the unusual gifts found to be possessed by the late Professor Chamberlain should, it was felt, be recognized and utilized. The University departments of history and of social science began by the giving of graduate courses not leading to the doctor's degree by professors in the College; these subjects, were, however, eventually accepted by the University, though not without some demur by the University faculty. These two seem to have been the only real instances of the establishment of new departments otherwise than by division or proliferation of older ones;¹ and no existing department was sacrificed to make them possible. (c) Some, perhaps most, of the trustees of 1920, in spite of the publication of this By-Law, seem to have forgotten its existence; and Dr. Atwood states that, so far as he can recall, he was unacquainted with it when he accepted the call to the presidency. (d) President Atwood states

¹ Separate Graduate departments—i.e., departments preparing candidates for the doctorate—in English and Modern Language never existed. Chemistry was one of the original departments, was suspended at a time of difficulty, and reestablished when circumstances permitted.

that "no curtailments in appropriations for departments were made until through retirement on account of age, or voluntary resignation or withdrawal, the personnel in certain departments was depleted."¹ (In one case, it should be added, the abolition of a department was made possible by the death of a professor.)

A charge of deliberate breach of faith in this matter will, therefore, not stand. Nevertheless the Clark University faculty has, the committee thinks, substantial ground for complaint in respect of the disregard of By-Law I. The trustees and still more the responsible administrative officers of a corporate body may reasonably be expected to be acquainted with the standing rules and the declarations of a promissory character of the corporation. The very circumstances which chiefly exclude a charge of conscious bad faith in this case also show on the part of the trustees and officials of Clark University a habitual unconcern as to the fact that the institution had certain unrepealed and annually republished statutes—an all too American readiness to enact and promulgate laws and then to pay little or no further attention to them. And the action taken in 1920, if without the intent, had nevertheless the effect, of a breach of faith. Any member of the faculty who read the Register published in the spring of that year had reasonable ground for believing that the existing departments were protected by By-Law I to the extent of the University's resources, and, if financial necessities made retrenchment inevitable, that it would not, at any rate, take the form of the introduction of a wholly new group of subjects through the elimination of several of the older ones. The University having had at the outset only sufficient funds to cover a few subjects, there was an obvious risk that some new board or president might sincerely hold that other subjects—such as philosophy, or the history of religions, or English literature, or vital statistics, or international law—were more important or more neglected than those already covered at Clark. The presumable object of the adoption of the By-Law was to assure the faculty and friends of the University against just such a shifting of the trustees' educational affections; and the only intelligible object of its republication was to renew that assurance. While the By-Law should not be construed as a Medo-Persian statute binding the trustees forever to maintain an unchanging number of departments, it clearly committed Clark

¹ This statement requires qualification; see below concerning departments of Chemistry and History and Social Sciences.

University—more explicitly than most institutions—to the general principle of continuity of development within the limits of practicability. As has been shown, adherence to that principle was by no means impracticable even in the difficult juncture which arose in the year 1919-20.

The principal considerations bearing specifically upon the justifiability of the new program may now be briefly recapitulated. That program, if it was to be really carried out, involved an all but complete break with the University's past; it was not, in reality, much less revolutionary than would be a plan for converting a medical school of thirty years' standing into a school of chemistry. It involved the sacrifice of the greater part of the assets already gained in the form of distinctive reputation, alumni loyalty and support, and specialized library and laboratory equipment. It was contrary to one of the most fundamental, characteristic, and frequently announced principles of the University's previous policy. These reasons combined to establish an almost overwhelming presumption against the course adopted. But they were, perhaps, not absolutely conclusive. Altered circumstances and new developments in science may at times justify a bold break with the past and the scrapping of old machinery. The occasional reapportionment of old endowments to meet new needs, so far as deeds of gift permit, is a necessary incident to educational progress. If a new school of geography was a greatly needed addition to the scientific and educational resources of the country; if the financial and other circumstances of Clark University were such as specially to mark it out for the task of establishing and maintaining a well-rounded and well-equipped school in this subject, such as was outlined at the time of President Atwood's inauguration; and if Dr. Atwood should manifest the powers of leadership and the administrative gifts requisite to bring the enterprise to success—then the new policy might by the value of its eventual fruits more than offset the immediate disadvantages certain to result from it. But upon the second, at least, of the three points last mentioned there was grave reason for doubt. A school of geography of the sort needed and proposed meant the maintenance of advanced instruction and research, not in a single science but in a considerable group of related sciences of an expensive character; and this was a paradoxically ambitious undertaking for an institution with no existing endowment for most of these subjects,

possessing a total income for its University departments of less than \$60,000, and required by considerations of good faith to devote a large part of this sum for a number of years to come—so far as could then be foreseen¹—to other purposes. To the committee it appears that for Clark University in 1920 some other program of concentration more consonant with the University's past activities would also have been more feasible, less hazardous, and not less capable of usefulness. In short, it is not evident that the reasons for the proposed program offset the presumption against it. However, the responsibility for the decision lay with the Board of Trustees; and a final judgment as to the wisdom of that decision can be reached only in the light of the concrete outcome of the experiment.

The committee now turns from the questions raised concerning the legitimacy of this change in the University's policy to consider the manner of its introduction and execution.

IV. FAILURE TO CONSULT FACULTY BEFORE ADOPTION OF NEW POLICY

It has been asserted in published charges, and is found by the committee to be the fact, that the new program was adopted by the trustees without any prior consultation with the Clark University faculty or with anybody representative of it. This appears to the committee to be one of the gravest aspects of the action of the Board of Trustees at that time. That matters of educational policy should not be decided by a lay governing board of a university without ascertaining the opinion of the educational staff or of its representatives is, the committee believes, a usually accepted principle; and if it were commonly disregarded the future of American higher education would not be hopeful. In this case a revolutionary change of policy was made in such a way that the faculty knew of it only after it was definitely adopted. It is true that the change proposed would affect adversely the interests of a number of teachers. This was a fact of which the trustees might reasonably take account in estimating the value of the advice received; but it was only an

¹ It is to be noted that the elimination of old departments through the resignation, retirement and death of professors occurred much more rapidly than could have been anticipated in 1920. It would be of interest to know how the new policy would have been carried out if the "drastic cutting of existing departments" had not been facilitated by unforeseen circumstances.

additional reason why, before final action, the teaching staff, and especially the heads of the departments likely to be affected, should be afforded opportunity to present their views on the proposal, to suggest and canvass possible alternatives, and to call attention to such considerations as have been pointed out in the preceding section of this report. A failure to obtain faculty opinion on such an essentially educational question is, in the committee's judgment, a violation of what should be regarded as a fundamental maxim of the constitutional law of any university. As the subsequent developments at Clark University tend to show, it is also highly imprudent. A matter on which the experienced scholars composing the Clark faculty were professionally competent to give advice, which affected vitally their personal plans and departmental policies, and which involved the abrogation of what some of them, at least, regarded as one of the conditions under which they had accepted and retained their appointments, was settled behind their backs; and the result was that when (in February, 1921) this fact was partly realized, a spirit of distrust and suspicion toward the trustees and the new administration began to develop. The governing authorities had not taken the faculty into their confidence at a critical juncture and upon a matter of common concern; and it was not surprising that they thereafter did not enjoy the confidence of the faculty. It should be noted, however, that the change of policy was not set forth until five months after the new president took office; and it is the general testimony that at the outset of his administration the attitude of the faculty toward him was cordial and cooperative.

V. CHARGE OF INSUFFICIENT NOTICE OF ADOPTION OF NEW POLICY

It is further charged by the complainants that even after the adoption of the new policy, due notice of it was not given. The complaint is stated in the following terms:

The faculty of the University were left in ignorance and even misled as to the true policy of the Administration, which policy was not made known to them, or to the public at large, until the spring of 1923, three years after its inception.

To this complaint President Atwood replies that "it is absurd for any member of the faculty who attended my inaugural exercises or

read my inaugural address, to hold that the policy of the administration was not made known."

The committee has examined the report of the inaugural exercises (of February 1, 1921) with reference to this question. The new president's address on "The Meaning of Geography in American Education," was devoted "to the consideration of certain conditions in this country which may indicate the significance of the new plans that have been made for Clark University." After setting forth the importance of geographical studies, President Atwood observed that in the United States "we have unfortunately neglected the development of research work" in this subject. He therefore announced that "after a careful study of the needs of higher education in this country the Trustees of Clark University adopted plans which, if successfully carried out, will lead to the development in Clark University of a department unique in America and preeminent in its special field. In addition to the regular collegiate course and to graduate work in *certain* of the strong departments for research already established, we shall offer to teachers, to men entering large business enterprises, especially international trade, . . . special facilities in the study of geography."¹ Dr. Atwood added, however, that "the study of history, economics, and the social sciences must proceed hand in hand with the study of geography, for we are aiming in the end to understand human geography." The Chairman of the Board of Trustees in his address on the same occasion remarked that "it is not necessary that this institution, founded as an innovation, shall cherish forever each and every detail that has found a place in its organization." Finally at the public dinner on the same evening several significant intimations of impending changes were given. Ex-President G. Stanley Hall said in his speech:

I know nothing of President Atwood's plans,² but my admonition to all my colleagues on the professorial staff, especially the older members, is to realize that Clark has a new president, and that changes, perhaps greater than they anticipated, are inevitable, and to loyally adjust to them.

The speech of Professor William Morris Davis, former head of the department at Harvard University from which President Atwood had come, contained the following passages:

¹ Italics not in original.

² This must be understood to refer to detailed plans; it appears that Dr. Hall was acquainted with the general nature of the new policy. The passage shows that he was not without premonitions of the difficulties that were to follow the adoption of that policy. Concerning his attitude toward its subsequent development the testimony is highly conflicting.

A world-wide future task remains in the more serious, mature, earnest study of the regions of the world. That is the future field of geographical study. And it is to this wide field that Clark University is now in large measure to address itself. . . . It is a great field to which this University is about to direct special attention. . . . It is to the better balanced development of an American school of geography that I hope the new President and the future professors and students of this university will address themselves. . . . The establishment of a graduate school of geography is a dream that I long have had, but I hardly imagined it possible to see the beginning of its realization; yet from what we have heard today the dream may become a reality, and it is with that prospect before you, Mr. President, that I salute you in your new position.

In view of all this, the charge that the Clark faculty was "left in ignorance" of the new policy and that that policy "was not made known to them or to the public at large until three years after its inception," cannot, in the committee's opinion, be sustained. It is difficult to conceive how any one who attended the inaugural exercises, or read the official report of them, can have failed to gather that a radical change of policy had been adopted; that this contemplated devoting the resources of the University primarily to the building up of a School of Geography "preeminent in its field;" that only "certain" of the existing graduate departments were to be developed in the future; and that foremost among the departments chosen for such development were those of history and the social sciences. Furthermore, as no intimation was given that additional endowments had been received or promised, it was a probable inference that the cost of the "new policy" must at the outset be defrayed from the existing income—which implied retrenchment elsewhere. Nor is it clear that the faculty in general failed to recognize that at least a considerable change of policy had been made. A member of the college faculty, in reply to a question, states that "it was generally assumed that geography would in the future take a place which would in general correspond to that held by psychology previously." One of the present complainants wrote President Atwood in October, 1921, the enthusiastic letter cited in the latter's statement (Appendix B). It would appear, indeed, that members of the historical and social-science departments clearly recognized in 1921 that a new orientation of the graduate work of the institution had been decided upon, and that this implied a strengthening and expansion of their own departments—a prospect which they naturally viewed with satisfaction.

While, then, the charge in the form stated is not justified, the question remains whether it has not a substantial residuum of truth. The statements made at President Atwood's inauguration were in general terms; they did not make explicit the implications of the new policy with respect to the future of all the departments, nor indicate how rapidly, by what means, and to what extent, any given department was to be reduced. To the teachers concerned, and especially to heads of departments, it was obviously important to know these details definitely and promptly. Candor would, then, have required that the faculty should be informed by the trustees or the president as to the specific program of readjustment which the new general policy entailed. The explanation of its principles and scope made public in 1923 was certainly much more definite than any previously given; and there is no apparent reason why at least an equally full statement should not have been communicated to the faculty in 1920 or 1921. In reply to inquiry as to why this was not done, members of the Board of Trustees with whom the chairman of this committee talked, explained that the Board, to the best of their recollection, had at the outset no definite plan for dealing with the older departments; it merely awaited the course of events to determine when and to what extent those departments should be reduced. But unless a question of prime importance was dealt with in an incredibly casual manner, those actually responsible for the policy of the University after 1920 must have had some definite understanding as to what subjects did and what did not fit in with the "new plan;" and that there was such an understanding is plainly implied by the statement of the Chairman of the Board in 1923. It has, however, been remarked by one trustee that it would have been inconsiderate and unwise for the Board or President to say (in substance) to men who had given years of faithful and distinguished service to the University that the Board only awaited the occasion of their retirement, resignation, or death in order to discontinue their departments. That this was a natural feeling the committee recognizes. But it is nevertheless of the opinion that it was entirely possible, without any reflection upon individuals and with less injury to the morale of the teaching body than has resulted from the contrary course, to notify the faculty that such considerations as were subsequently set forth in 1923 made it very unlikely that certain specified departments could be

further developed or even indefinitely continued. To such notification, at least, the men in these departments were absolutely entitled. This is especially evident in the case of the younger professors in subjects of which the discontinuance was contemplated.

The faculty, then, were left to make their own inferences, from the hints given at the inaugural exercises and from the course of events, as to the scope and guiding principles of the policy of elimination of departments. Enough had been said and done to cause lively apprehension, and not enough to make clear how much was really to be apprehended. Anything more effective than this combination for destroying the morale of any body of men it would be difficult to find. It is unlikely that the new policy could in any case have been put into effect without arousing protest among both the faculty and alumni. But the friction inevitably resulting from the policy itself was greatly intensified by the manner of its introduction, already set forth, and by a series of subsequent incidents which marked the tempestuous history of Clark University from 1921 to 1923.

VI. INCIDENTS OF 1921-1923

1. *Situation in 1921-2.*—After the formal inauguration of the new administration the president continued to be largely engrossed with the organization of the department of geography, apparently unaware of the feeling which was developing in the teaching staff, especially after the first two steps in the actual execution of the new policy—the discontinuance of biology and mathematics—were taken without any conference with or explanation to the faculty. This tension was increased by certain administrative acts that seemed to conflict with the form of government which the faculty generally understood to have been adopted. During 1920-21 a faculty committee cooperating with the president had worked out regulations covering these matters, one of which read in part as follows:

Graduate Board.—1. The Graduate Board shall consist of the President as chairman, at least one representative of each department offering instruction leading to the degree of doctor of philosophy, and such other members as they may elect. . . .

2. The Graduate Board shall lay down such regulations as it may deem necessary or expedient for the organization and control of graduate work or for the maintenance of the standard of the graduate degrees, and exercise a general supervision over all matters pertaining solely to graduate work.

The same board was given power to fix the requirements for advanced degrees, to pass upon the work of candidates for such degrees, and to make recommendations to the trustees for appointments to fellowships and scholarships. It was therefore with natural surprise that members of the faculty found in the proof of the new catalogue, 1921, the official announcements of the "graduate school of geography." Not only had the Graduate Board not been consulted about this, but the president stated that, as the new department had been established by the trustees as a separate "school," it would not be under the jurisdiction of the Graduate Board. This clearly produced a very unhappy impression upon the minds of a number of professors; it seemed to them a technicality designed to exempt the work in geography and the requirements for advanced degrees in that subject from the control of the University faculty.¹ Later in 1921 a summer school was established, also without the prior knowledge or advice of the faculty. There were several minor incidents which need not be mentioned here; and it is plain that by the spring of 1922 the feeling was widespread among the faculty, not only that revolutionary changes in educational policy were in process, but that it was the settled method of the administration to disregard the provisions for faculty participation in shaping such policy, and to accomplish its ends by presenting the educational staff with a series of *faits accomplis*.

The state of mind which the new policy and the administrative methods of the new president had, by the beginning of March, 1922, produced in many of the faculty may be judged from a lengthy memorial designed for presentation to the Board of Trustees, drawn up at that time by a group comprising a majority of the University professors then in residence (including all of the present complainants), together with several of the collegiate professors. A small part of this document is here reproduced:

We believe that a serious situation has been created within the University by reason of the failure of the Trustees to consult with their Faculty, whom they had chosen presumably because of their fitness for academic responsibility, in major matters of academic policy. Within the last two years the Trustees have without consultation or advice with their Faculty, chosen a President for the University and have established a Graduate School of Geography that is independent of the existing faculties, and a Summer School that centers about

¹ At present, as the committee is informed by President Atwood, the School of Geography has the same relation to the Graduate Board as any other department.

the subject of geography and that is also independent of other existing faculties. In so doing the Trustees have made no announcement of general policy indicating their intentions toward the existent institution in the future.

The result of this course has been, not only to undermine the sense of security of position of the members of the Faculty but also seriously to interfere with the effective work of the professorial staff. A professor cannot feel or exercise responsibility when he is given no opportunity to advise in the formulation of the major policies which concern his work and in which he is supposedly a specialist. Nor is it possible for a professor to support the administration or cooperate with it, when the fundamental policy of the administration remains unknown to him. We wish therefore in general to urge upon the President and the Board of Trustees the immediate establishment of some means for their effective consultation with their Faculty, a means in which the initiative shall lie with the Faculty, as well as with the President and the Board; and since the present situation is acute and men of ability or promise will undoubtedly be lost to the University unless action is had, we wish further to make specific requests, as set forth below, for information concerning the policy of the present administration in order that those in immediate charge of the academic work of the University may work intelligently and with continuity of purpose, and in general govern their actions accordingly. We beg to call attention to the fact that the desire of the Faculty to be apprized of the general policy of the administration is historically justified and has remained unsatisfied.

We therefore request in the first place that the Board or the President state the policy of the administration with respect to graduate instruction and research in general, and that it give some indication of the extent to which it is prepared to go in the support of productive scholarship by the University.

We beg to point out that a most unusual situation is created by reason of the fact that the head of the Department of Geography, who is charged with the promotion and development of his department, is also President of the University, whose chief charge is the promotion of the interests and the development of the University as a whole. This duality of function of the executive is known to have worked unsatisfactorily in this institution in the past, and presumably contributed in part to the state of affairs which the Trustees have sought to remedy by a reorganization of the University; and the continuance of this dual function of the executive, under the circumstances attendant upon his organization of a new department and his establishment of new extra-mural relationships for the University, has resulted in an even more unsatisfactory situation, for the President has now so many responsibilities that he has been unable to propose or formulate a solution of the important matters of policy mentioned in this communication. Moreover, it would seem to be impossible for these two functions to be executed simultaneously by a single individual without prejudice of the one to the other—an incompatibility that has long been recognized in courts of law.

To meet, in part, this unusual situation, we request that the Board of Trustees take immediate steps to establish machinery whereby intimate consultation between the Board and the Faculty can occur in major matters of academic policy, and in which the initiative can be invoked as readily by the Faculty as

by the Board. We believe that the existence of the present conditions within the University amply demonstrates the futility of the present machinery which operates only indirectly through the President, and that the single avenue of approach or conference between the two bodies only on the initiative of the Board prevents, even in matters of the utmost importance, the operation of any mechanism of decision that approximates discussion. This view is similar to the view of the Founder of the University in his suggestions in the fifth codicil of his will concerning the control of the Department of Arts and Sciences. . . .

In making these requests we are convinced of the gravity of the situation with which they deal. We feel that immediate action is necessary in order that the work of the University may continue to be effective and that the more able men on the faculty may be retained by the University. We feel that much in the way of amelioration can be accomplished by a concrete and definite statement of policy by the Board or the President. We respectfully beg that this statement be made as promptly as possible, and in writing, to the Faculty of the University.

The memorial also called attention to the provisions, already cited, of By-Law I, and requested "that the Board inform the faculty whether this By-Law has been repealed, and, if it has been repealed, the date of its repeal; and further, that, if it has been repealed, it be reenacted and the faculty so informed."¹

It is clear from this petition that in the winter of 1921-22 most of the faculty remained in doubt about the definite implications of the new policy; that several heads of departments consequently felt unable to frame their departmental plans or to decide whether it was wise for them to remain at Clark; that, so far as the new policy had been disclosed, it met with vigorous, though not universal, faculty opposition; and that the new administration failed to command the confidence of most of the faculty.

Before this petition could be formally signed and presented, there supervened a sensational incident which, though it had no relation to the new policy, still further injured the position of the administration.

2. *The Nearing Incident.*—The Clark University Liberal Club was organized in 1920 by a group of students for the purpose of bringing to the university speakers "on the economic and political issues of the day." According to the testimony of the president of the Club in 1922, Mr. D. Ross Fraser, "it represented no political or economic bias and an endeavor was made to alternate speakers of conflicting opinions. The Liberal Club was in no way connected with any of the national groups by that or any other name." The

¹ Whether, in view of By-Law III, this petition would have been received by the Trustees, is not known to the Committee.

list of speakers bears out these statements; it had included, for example, both extreme advocates and severe critics of socialism. In February, 1922, Mr. Fraser asked President Atwood's permission to use the Library Hall for a public meeting on March 14th, to be addressed by Dr. Scott Nearing. Though expressing disapproval of Nearing's views, Dr. Atwood gave his consent; but a few days before the 14th he asked Mr. Fraser (as the latter states), "if we could not postpone our lecture, as he had arranged a geography lecture for the same night, for which he must have the use of the Library Hall." As arrangements were already made and tickets printed, a change of date was not possible; but the Club was compelled to transfer its meeting to another building. An audience of some 300, students, teachers, and citizens of Worcester, gathered to hear Mr. Nearing's address, which dealt with "The Control of Public Opinion." The committee has not seen the text of the entire lecture but has before it a rather full summary; this is declared by Dr. Nearing, Professors Barnes, Hankins, Mr. Fraser, and others present to be essentially accurate, but its correctness is denied by President Atwood. As reported, the lecture was "a consideration of the methods whereby the leisure class is able to control public opinion." It sought to show that the principal agencies by which public opinion is naturally formed and directed—the press, the church, the legal profession, and educational institutions—are dependent for their prosperity upon the good-will of the wealthy classes, and are therefore unduly subject to control by a single social group. It will suffice to quote three representative passages from the abstract, which has already been published (*Clark College Monthly*, March, 1922):

The Church is another important institution whereby our public opinion is created and shaped. The Church with its varied activities, has come to need large sums of money for support. A small part of its essential income may be raised from the contributions of the poor communicants, but the greater portion must come from the gifts of the few wealthy parishioners. This last group, naturally, is not eager to contribute to an institution which is likely to condemn its possession of great wealth. Hence the majority of clergymen are compelled to sanction and approve the present distribution of wealth, and to reinforce the view that it is wicked to question the rectitude of the present economic stratification of society. Those who attempt to set up the church as a critic of economic injustices usually meet a summary and tragic fate, which discourages a repetition of the experiment. The example of the Interchurch World Movement,

and the defection of the wealthy sponsors of the movement after its criticism of the United States Steel Corporation, is a recent case in point. Yet an occasional courageous individual, like Phillips Brooks, may do much to arouse a spirit of reform in the church.

Education is also adjusted to the task of creating a philosophy of justification of great inequalities in wealth in the community. Secondary education is built and operated upon the almost entirely unquestioning acceptance of the existing order in all of its phases. In New York State no teacher in the secondary schools can advocate any change in any form of government existing in any part of the world, even by peaceful means. The higher education, as Professor Veblen has shown in his *Higher Learning in America*, has also come to reflect the philosophy of the present-day business man. The universities, aside from the state universities, are supported by endowments and benefactions made by business men. Naturally, there is a tendency to adapt the policies and teaching of such institutions to the philosophy of the business man, in order that he may be induced to make the much needed additions to the endowments. The board of trustees is usually composed of business men, or their legal representatives.

There are two possible modes of activity open to those who desire to break down the domination of public opinion by the vested interests. One is the road of action in organizing movements to create a new social order. The other is the approach of the social philosopher, who studies the existing order, reveals its weaknesses and injustices, and indicates the desirable path of reform. One should follow the alternative which is best adapted to his inclinations and talents. The chief obstacle to the effective development of thought and action contrary to the vested interests is the fact that their pecuniary resources enable them to pick off the best brains in the country and enlist them in their service. In every profession, a far greater material reward goes to those who engage in business pursuits than to those who engage in reform in either action or thought. One can make more money writing for the *Cosmopolitan* than in compiling the most learned treatises. One can acquire greater wealth in designing suits or Arrow collars, than in executing the most self-expressive creation of artistic genius. No matter how great one's talents or in what line they may lie, he may be seduced by the representatives of great wealth, for their needs are most diverse, and their resources unlimited.

The committee quotes the testimony of Mr. Fraser (which is supported by that of other witnesses) concerning the incident which occurred as the lecture was drawing to a close:

Nearing had been talking for over an hour when Dr. Atwood and party entered the hall, after the very sparsely attended geography lecture had reached its conclusion. Nearing at that time was speaking on the control of education by the "vested interests" and their ability to control the development of thought, quoting freely from works by Thorstein Veblen, a relative of the president. President Atwood heard about five minutes of the lecture and in a white passion came rushing over to where I was sitting in the back part of the hall and demanded that I "stop this," "stop it at once." I was stunned naturally, and

was slow to grasp the true meaning, and answered the President that we could not stop the meeting now. Angered still further at my reply, he clutched me by the shoulder, bringing me to my feet, saying that it was "disgusting" and that he could not let it go on. There was nothing to do but speak to Professor Nearing, so I went to the platform. President Atwood announced, "This meeting is dismissed," and had to repeat it three times before the astounded audience could truly comprehend his meaning. As the audience was slow in departing and much heated over the insulting action of the president, the latter ordered the janitor to extinguish the lights and, if that failed, that the police would be summoned. . . . Nearing finished his speech at one of the nearby fraternity houses to which the majority of the crowd adjourned.

A few days later Dr. Atwood at the request of the student body delivered an address (subsequently published by the University) on "Extra-Curricula (*sic*) Activities and Academic Freedom" in which he explained his position as follows:

I closed the meeting because I was unwilling to have the University in any way, directly or indirectly, actually or apparently, responsible for our students' listening any longer to the sentiments which were being expressed by the speaker. The point at issue is not alone one of my disapproval of his malignment of the moral integrity of the American people. I take the position that not only the sentiments he was expressing but the unscientific method of presentation, and the intemperate manner in which he was conducting the address, made it inappropriate for a university hall. Even if his beliefs and theories are right and those of all others who differ from him are wrong, I know that I should have closed that meeting. I do not regret that I have shown in a positive way that I disapprove of such influences within the halls of a university.

Gentlemen, I believe in the freedom of speech. An open forum, where all kinds of ideas may be aired, may serve a very useful purpose in our society, but I am certain in my own mind that a university should not be conducted on that basis. When you are admitted as students to this university, you are not by that act given the right or privilege of calling to the halls of the university any whom you may select to assist us in our educational work. Remember that the education which you obtain while you are here at this institution is not limited to the class room instruction All that comes into your lives while you are here has an educational influence upon you. Education is almost a mysterious process. Most significant lessons may come in some fraternity house conversation, or on the athletic field, or when you work together to produce just as good a dramatic performance as you can. It may be that you learn the most important principles which are to guide you in life in the gymnasium, in your Debating Society, or when some issue comes up in a student organization.

The faculty of this institution and, as far as I know, of all other similar educational institutions, retains a form of control over the so-called extra-curricula activities. It was but a few weeks ago that a group of you came in and asked my permission to secure an additional coach for basketball. The plans for the

Debating Society are submitted for approval to the officers of the institution. So also I am kept informed as to all social events and the public appearances of the Dramatic Club. I consider the activities of the so-called Liberal Clubs in American Colleges to be extra-curricula activities. As yet we have made no special provision here at Clark for over-seeing or in any way directing these particular activities and therefore, until some other provision is made, I shall feel the responsibility of deciding what speakers you may invite to the university to address you in our halls. . . . I consider this to be my very serious responsibility, and in carrying out that responsibility I shall be guided by the very best motives for your good, and the desire that the university may retain the respect and confidence of the American people.¹

The rest of the address is concerned with a topic not directly pertinent to the Nearing incident, that of the freedom of the teacher within the university. On this Dr. Atwood enunciated a number of sentiments with which this committee is in agreement, and quoted extensively and with approval from the first report of this Association's Committee on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure, 1915. It is to be noted, however, that these extracts broke off somewhat prematurely. Dr. Atwood's citations end with the sentence: "But there may, undoubtedly, arise occasional cases in which the aberrations of individuals may require to be checked by definite disciplinary action." This was immediately followed in the 1915 Report by the sentence: "What this report chiefly maintains is that such action cannot with safety be taken by bodies not composed of members of the academic profession." After elaborating this point, the report laid down the principle that "official action relating to reappointments and refusals of reappointments should be taken only with the advice and consent of some board or committee representative of the faculty." With these sentences omitted, Dr. Atwood's student hearers were likely to get a somewhat erroneous impression of this Association's position.

President Atwood's action and his subsequent speech obviously raise in a concrete way an issue of importance for most American colleges—that of the freedom to be granted student societies in inviting outside speakers to address their meetings. With Mr.

¹ At a faculty meeting held shortly after, a more moderate position with respect to the control of student organizations was taken. It was voted that, "as concerns meetings of student organizations that are open to members of the institution in general, speakers from outside the institution should be invited only with the approval of a joint board in which students and faculty are equally represented;" and that as concerns private meetings of such organizations "the responsibility is to be placed upon the organization, with the provision that each student organization shall select a member of the faculty as counselor."

Atwood's view on this subject the committee is wholly unable to agree. Voluntary student organizations for intellectual purposes, for the study of social problems, or for becoming acquainted with contemporary political and social movements, especially those current among social groups other than that to which most American college students belong, ought to be encouraged in every possible way; they are among the most welcome evidences that a student body is both intellectually and morally alive. The principal thing that may be legitimately demanded of them is that they shall be open-minded, ready to give a fair hearing to both sides or all sides of questions upon which serious differences of opinion prevail among thoughtful persons. To this requirement the Liberal Club of Clark University fully conformed. Dr. Atwood, however, expressly holds that a less degree of freedom of speech on public questions should obtain in universities than in the community at large; the process of education seems to him so delicate and mysterious, and the danger so great that the minds of university students will be infected with error through even a single brief exposure to it, that an "open forum where all kinds of ideas may be aired," though useful elsewhere, is inadmissible in a university. He conceives it, in short, to be a function of a university to protect students against even hearing doctrines which to the president or faculty seem pernicious; and consequently regards it as an important part of the duty of a university executive to act as a chief of quarantine with respect to political, sociological and economic ideas.

Such a conception seems to the committee to betray a failure to understand either the spirit of a university or the ordinary workings of human nature. The sane view of this matter has, in the committee's opinion, been admirably expressed by President E. M. Hopkins in a letter replying to the complaint of an alumnus that Mr. W. Z. Foster had been permitted to address a meeting of a student club at Dartmouth College. Though this letter has recently been published in the *Bulletin*, it is so apposite to the present case that a portion of it, the committee feels, should be incorporated in this report. Dr. Hopkins wrote:

If Dartmouth were a training school trying to discipline men into an acceptance of the theory that all present-day procedures were desirable for permanency and for the advantage of group welfare, the college ought definitely to assume responsibility not only for what should be taught in every course, but what

should be said by every member of the faculty, and what men should be allowed to speak before the student body even on the invitation of independent undergraduate organizations. Believing definitely, however, that the function of an educational institution is to allow men access to different points of view, and to secure their adherence to conclusions on the basis of their own thinking rather than to attempt to corral them within given mental areas, I am bound to hold that freedom of speech and even the presenting of pernicious doctrine is not antagonistic to the college purpose, so long as like access is given to the student to all points of view, and stimulation is given to his own mind to weigh these things for himself. However, as a matter of practice, entirely aside from the theory which I have enunciated, repression and censorship never work within an intellectually alert group of boys such as constitute the college. . . I cannot understand the attitude of men who wish their sons to go out into the world entirely uninformed as to what demagogues and social critics are saying, and thus without any consciousness of the kind of thing on which their industrial brothers are biting. . . . Thus it comes about that though I would not invite Mr. Foster to Dartmouth College, and though I have not the slightest desire to hear him present his theories, I have no intention of making any move which will deny a group of serious-minded men the opportunity of hearing what Mr. Foster really thinks, and what he argues ought to be done. I am not so fearful in regard to the claims of intelligence and wisdom before an undergraduate body that I think these can be dispelled by the single appearance of one of Mr. Foster's type.¹

But the unseemly incident of the evening of March 14, 1922, would, of course, not be justified even though President Atwood's general view on this question were accepted. For before that incident Dr. Atwood himself did not take the position which he subsequently formulated; while declaring emphatic disapproval of Dr. Nearing's doctrines, he had nevertheless officially sanctioned the lecture—which, it may be added, appears to have presented no opinions not well known in advance to be held by the lecturer. Dr. Atwood's violent interruption of an authorized lecture—of which he had himself heard only a fragment—could be extenuated only as the hasty act of a hot-tempered man; but as he has since repeatedly defended it, the committee is compelled to conclude that he deliberately believes his conduct on that occasion not to have been seriously lacking in self-control, courtesy, good faith towards the student officers of the club, and practical good sense. On these points the committee deems it gratuitous to offer any comment.

The record of this incident should not conclude without some mention of the action of the student body of the University. Re-

¹ President Hopkins' letter is published in full in this *Bulletin* for March last (X, pp. 32-4).

sentment of the president's closing of the meeting was intense and apparently almost universal among the students. A statement, signed by the executives of every undergraduate student organization, twenty-four in number, was drawn up and published, asserting that the University had been committed by its founder and its first president to the principle of freedom of speech and discussion, and that it would "cease to exist as an institution of higher learning when it is deprived of those peculiarly characteristic principles." The *Clark College Monthly* devoted most of its next number to the incident, and declared editorially that the position of the president was "not in accord with the ideals of the students." The president of the junior class (Mr. L. P. White) wrote Dr. Atwood, saying:

During the past week, whether or not you realize it, you have alienated unfortunately the support of many able students in this university who, up until now, have held towards yourself sentiments of enthusiastic loyalty not unmixed with much real affection. I believe this has come about not primarily because of the regrettable Nearing incident, but because in all the controversy that has since been spread in the press you have failed to make a single move towards conferring with the leading students of your undergraduate body whose names were affixed to the document setting forth the stand of the student body. On the other hand there have appeared in the press statements attributed to you reflecting upon the ability of the student body to reach sane conclusions. Indeed the intelligence of the whole student body has been questioned. I do not assume that you were correctly quoted, but I know that a denial from you, or better still, a conference, would have had a salutary effect. You now face a hostile student body because you have appeared to patronize their elected representatives.

President Atwood replied, promising a conference with student representatives, and adding: "I shall be willing to tell you some things which I thought it absolutely imperative that I omit from any public statement. The situation which I am facing has a very direct bearing upon some fundamental questions before the American people." Mr. White in his testimony to the committee states that "the 'fundamental questions before the American people' turned out in later conferences to be vague generalizations concerning 'Reds and Bolsheviks' in our universities. For this reason subsequent conferences lapsed." So general was the student feeling that it was thought wise by the president to discontinue for a time the weekly assemblies, lest the antagonism of the student body be too openly manifested. At the following Commencement the Senior Class unanimously adopted resolutions in which it declared:

"First, that there has been a distinct disintegration of morale in the undergraduate student body. Second, that this disintegration is not traceable to 'a few discontented professors who spread their feeling among the students.' Third, that this disintegration is a direct result of President Atwood's failure intelligently to cooperate with student leaders. On the contrary, he has by his statements and acts directly antagonized said leaders. Fourth, that the only hope of revival of a wholesome morale lies not in a continuation of present relations, but rather in a policy of conciliation and intimate cooperation."

On this phase of the incident the committee thinks that two comments may fairly be made: (1) that the alumni of Clark College, as well as of the University, may justly feel pride in the fact that the student body of 1922 identified loyalty to the institution with loyalty to a principle which they regarded as of the essence of the life of that institution; (2) that President Atwood's dealings with the students (even after March 14) were lacking in tact and in understanding. His attitude was at first contemptuous, afterwards condescendingly paternalistic; and the most unhappy impression of all seems to have been produced upon this group of young men by the president's attempt to raise the issue of "Bolshevism"—the irrelevance of which they were clear-headed enough to see.

3. *Effects of Nearing Incident.*—It is evidently the belief of President Atwood, as shown by his statement to this committee, that the Nearing incident was the first cause of disaffection towards him in the faculty (Appendix B). He regards the whole agitation as due to the efforts of a small group of "radical" professors who resented his closing of the Nearing meeting. In this, the committee is convinced, as in several other instances, Dr. Atwood has seriously misconceived the realities of the situation. The testimony of nearly all members of the faculty questioned on the point is that unrest and distrust of the administration began long before, and were chiefly due to those causes which have been set forth earlier in this report. The preponderant immediate effect of the Nearing incident was, in fact, the reverse of that supposed by Dr. Atwood: it in some respects diminished the tension in the faculty. For the faculty was divided in its judgment of that affair, and some men who had hitherto vigorously criticized the methods and policy of the new administration ceased for a time to do so, lest the grounds of their criticism be misunderstood. Conclusive proof of this is furnished by the fact that the faculty memorial above referred to was not sent, because, as several witnesses inform the committee,

"the occurrence of the Nearing incident in March, 1922, made some members of the faculty who had taken part in drafting the petition unwilling to take part in any demonstration of unrest lest they should be connected thereby with the issue of radicalism."

That this petition was not sent is, the committee thinks, unfortunate; it might perhaps have made the trustees and president realize the gravity of the situation and the state of feeling of the faculty, and thus have helped to avert the more serious disturbances which occurred later. But at all events, it is clear that, so far from being the primary occasion of faculty "agitation," the Nearing episode temporarily tended to put a quietus upon it. On the other hand, it is true that Professors Barnes and Hankins, who had at first been sympathetic towards the new policy and had entertained enthusiastic hopes of the new administration, strongly disapproved of Dr. Atwood's action on March 14, and made this clear to him. Professor Barnes, who had been in the chair at the meeting, wrote the President on March 24 a long letter containing the following passages:

I have hesitated to communicate with you concerning the recent diversely unfortunate incident in the University, because of uncertainty as to the real issues involved, beyond those apparent to all. I need not tell you that my own feelings have been a strange mixture of astonishment and regret, mingled with no little resentment that you should force me into open opposition to the administration when I have certainly given convincing evidence of my desire to co-operate in a friendly manner towards the development of Clark University, I am impelled to write you at the present time because of the memory of a clash in another institution of learning where I could have healed the breach if I had but made the effort in time. I may be too late now. If I speak frankly you will understand that it is because clarity and honest understanding seem to me to be the indispensable beginning of any possible repair of the damage which has been done....

From the papers, from your address on Monday, and from certain reports I have had of your conferences with students I gather that you feel that there has been a plot against you and that the students have been incited to act by those outside of the student body. Until you free yourself of this notion, however, you can begin no constructive effort to remedy the situation. It is probably certain that in no other institution in the country would student opinion and action so surely coalesce against interference with freedom of assembly and speech as at Clark University. That has so long been the chief tradition of the institution that it has an emotional as well as an intellectual character. . . . You did the one and only thing which could produce an immediate and spontaneous unity in the student body, graduate and undergraduate. . . . I need

not tell you that I am not a Socialist. I have no faith in any one scheme or program of social reform. I had little interest in having Nearing come here. I was not consulted about securing him, but he is so conservative as compared with many who have spoken here before that I gave the proposal little thought. I introduced him simply because the president of the Liberal Club was timid about facing the crowd, and I acceded to his request so that the audience would not be kept waiting. I had been requested by you shortly before to introduce three equally radical Russians. No one suspects me of sponsoring "Reds."

In general, I believe that the best curative for all the past difficulties is to enunciate a policy of firm support of scholarly research and productivity, get behind men and departments likely to secure such results, abandon any trend towards a patriarchal interest in petty details of local administration and student activities, and allow the past to be forgotten in the exhilaration of the conspicuous achievements of the future. If you are willing to make such an effort you can be assured of my hearty support.

President Atwood replied as follows:

I wish to acknowledge your letter of March 24 in which you present very fully your analysis of my character and of my actions as administrator. I sincerely regret that you, of your own free will, took an active part in "open opposition to the administration" on a purely administrative matter.

I am just as enthusiastic in my support of scholarly research and productivity as I have ever been. In fact, the recent experiences which I have had here at Clark convince me of the still greater need in this country of scholarly research.

Thus the Nearing incident alienated the confidence of those professors who had hitherto been most hopeful of the new administration. The most regrettable consequence of this incident, however, was its effect upon the mind of Dr. Atwood himself. Believing the criticism of his administration to date from this time and to be due to sympathy with the views of the lecturer on that occasion, and conceiving of himself as the victim of "radical" persecution and therefore as in some sense a champion of conservative and patriotic principles, he has, it is clear, fitted into this picture of the situation many facts which have in reality no connection with the episode of March 14, and has therefore frequently been unable to understand the causes and significance of what was occurring in the University and among the alumni. It may be said here that the subsequent petitions of Western and Eastern alumni calling for the president's removal seem to the committee to be due only in small part to the Nearing incident, and that these movements originated

among and were organized by alumni and not by the complainants, though two of the latter gave to the second of these movements a small amount of assistance.¹

4. *Incident of the Deanship.*—The disturbing effect of the Nearing incident upon the president's administrative judgment is illustrated by a small incident which occurred shortly after. It had been decided that an additional professor of economics and sociology, who should also serve as dean of the College, should be appointed. For this position Mr. D. R. Taft of Wells College had been recommended by the head of the department at Clark, Professor F. H. Hankins, and by the faculty Committee on Appointments. The president appeared to be favorable to the recommendation. On March 23 Mr. Taft wrote President Atwood expressing his readiness to accept the appointment if officially tendered, and requesting, in justice to the Wells College authorities, an early reply; the letter contained no reference to the Nearing incident. President Atwood replied in terms in which Mr. Taft, as a candidate for appointment, was, in substance, called upon to attest his future "loyalty to the administration" by approving its position in the Nearing controversy. At a subsequent conference, Mr. Taft states, the president manifested "a very strong feeling of personal bitterness towards a few members of the faculty." Mr. Taft endeavored "to impress upon the president the desire of all, even those who opposed him on the Nearing issue, to cooperate," and especially "the fact that none of them were really Socialists." President Atwood, however, "stressed the seriousness of the personal quarrel." In the end the appointment was not made. The president's resentment of the criticism to which he had been subjected by some of his colleagues was natural, especially as the criticism was, in substance, just; but his state of feeling did not make for wise administrative decisions, nor alleviate a situation already sufficiently difficult.

5. *Departments of Sociology and History.*—The purpose—announced as a part of the new policy in February, 1921—of expanding the university work in the social sciences and in history, as subjects cognate to geography, seems to have been kept in mind up to the time of the two incidents last recorded, *i.e.*, until the spring of 1922; but thereafter it failed of fulfilment. In the following summer the head of the department of sociology and economics, Professor

¹ See Appendix E.

Hankins, resigned, to accept a more attractive position elsewhere; in his letter of resignation he said:

Doubt as to the future of the social sciences at Clark has been a factor in my decision. . . The reduction in the appropriation for instruction in economics, . . . above all the unexplained shattering of the plans approved last spring for the expansion of the department—these are only a few of the ways in which you made it plain that the social sciences were not only not to be encouraged but might not even be maintained in an integral position. It appeared that we should enter the coming year without sufficient instruction in the social sciences to make possible an undergraduate major.

In April, 1923, Dr. H. E. Barnes, professor of the history of thought and culture, resigned under similar circumstances, and wrote in his letter of resignation:

My decision is the product of complete discouragement, not to say despair, with respect to the future, not merely of Clark University, but also the departments of history and the allied social sciences. . . You have repeatedly stated from the time of your election to the presidency. . . . that it was your aim to strengthen these departments. After the passage of three years, not only has this development not taken place, but these departments are infinitely weaker than they were in 1919. The department of political and social science is practically extinct, and will be entirely so at the close of the year. . . . The history department is exactly in the situation that it was in 1919. . . I think that I demonstrated my real interest in the building up of the School of Geography and my almost pathetic desire to cooperate in anything which would lead to the growth of the prestige and prosperity of Clark University; but I have given up the attempt now as utterly hopeless.

Thus, within three years after the adoption of the new program, what had originally been an essential part of it seemed to have been abandoned; and two members of those older departments which alone had appeared to be assured against elimination under the new policy, left the University feeling that their departments were being crippled and that the expectations which they had been officially encouraged to form had not been fulfilled.¹

6. *Department of Psychology.*—After President Hall's resignation, Dr. Sanford had returned to the professorship in the University department of psychology which he had formerly held. Dr. Edwin G. Boring had in 1919 received a three-year appointment as professor of experimental psychology and director of the laboratory. About the future of experimental psychology no clear indication

¹ In 1923-24 these departments continued to give graduate work, with the same number of instructors as in 1920.

was given at the time of the promulgation of the new policy. But as the subject required the maintenance of a laboratory, was not obviously related to geography, and was extensively pursued in other universities, it did not logically fit into the new scheme. Nevertheless the action of the administration was perplexingly vacillating. When in the spring of 1921 Dr. Boring, having received a call to another university, talked the matter over with the president, he "secured a brief, formal admission" that his "work was satisfactory," but to the question whether his going would relieve the president of embarrassment Dr. Atwood declined to reply. Dr. Boring testifies that he gained the strong impression that the president wished him to resign. Yet soon after Dr. Boring received from the president, on behalf of the Board of Trustees, an assurance that there would be "no curtailment of the appropriations for the maintenance of the psychological laboratories next year," notice of an increase of salary, and a declaration that the finance committee of the Board saw no reason why, at the expiration of his contract, Dr. Boring "should not be reappointed at an additional advance of salary." "It is our desire," wrote the president, "to maintain a strong department in psychology and retain the prestige which this university held in that field. We believe you can be of real service in that work." Dr. Boring accordingly declined the other call, and for a time continued hopefully at Clark. But when, in the following year, he was approached with reference to an appointment at Harvard, and so informed President Atwood, the latter expressed doubts whether psychology could be "successful" at Clark, and by his general attitude caused Dr. Boring to lose confidence in the possibility of continuing graduate work in experimental psychology, "with the obvious lack of support by the administration." Dr. Boring therefore accepted the Harvard position; his associate, Dr. C. C. Pratt, left at the same time. The next year the trustees voted that graduate work in psychology leading to the Ph.D. be discontinued.¹ At the time of preparation of this report it has been resumed.

A sequel to this incident should be mentioned. When interviewed by a reporter concerning his resignation, Dr. Boring gave as

¹ The evidence for this is a statement in a letter from Dr. Sanford to Dr. Boring, May 4, 1923; "In view of the shortness of money, the trustees have voted, with my ungrudging concurrence, to give up work for the Ph.D. in psychology until more money is available." Dr. Sanford later expresses the belief that the suppression of graduate work in psychology was not a permanent policy, "though it will undoubtedly continue until the institution is in a better financial condition." The financial difficulty was presumably due chiefly to the appropriations for geography.

his principal reason for leaving Clark the "greater opportunity for research in psychology" offered by his new position, but added: "I am not in sympathy with the educational policy of Clark University, in that it seems to tend away from ideals of research and scholarly productivity . . . But there has been no particular friction between myself and the administration."

When shown this, President Atwood issued a statement in reply, in the course of which he said: "There is no need of either Dr. Boring or Dr. Pratt resigning, for their terms of appointment expired this spring and they have not been recommended for reappointment."¹ This was published under the headlines: "Boring and Pratt Not Wanted, Says Atwood. Neither Would Have Received Reappointment." In the committee's opinion, President Atwood's statement was a *suggestio falsi*; and if the injurious suggestion was unintentional, the interpretation naturally given the statement by the local newspaper should have been promptly corrected. The implication that either Dr. Pratt or Dr. Boring was about to be refused reappointment is shown by sufficient evidence to be groundless.

7. *Department of Physics.*—In the record of these unhappy years at Clark University it is necessary to include some mention of a distressing personal tragedy. On May 15, 1923, Professor Arthur Gordon Webster, one of the most eminent and honored not only among the Clark faculty but among American physicists, took his own life in his office at the University. The Committee refers to this because it feels bound frankly to take note of the fact that the mental depression into which Professor Webster had fallen has been often, though seldom publicly, represented as the consequence of disappointment and apprehension due chiefly to the new policy of the University. The committee doubts whether it or any one except a psychiatrist intimately acquainted with the case is qualified to form a confident judgment on the causes of that despondency by which this man of high character and brilliant gifts and achievement was so strangely overwhelmed. That it had no adequate or rational grounds is clear. But the note which Dr. Webster left and the testimony of friends seem to indicate that it took form chiefly in an excessive feeling of dissatisfaction with his own scientific work—the feeling of a man of ardent and eager

¹ Worcester Evening Gazette, May 3, 1922. The reporter who received this statement from Dr. Atwood testifies to the accuracy of the report above cited.

temper, of extraordinarily great intellectual ambitions and exacting scientific standards, who found the science to which he had devoted his life immensely transformed and expanded at the time when he himself became sensible of the diminished energies of advancing years. "Physics has got away from me and I cannot come back"—these seem the most revealing words in the message that he left. What part other causes—such as the disturbed conditions at Clark University and his knowledge that the study of physics probably had no future there—may have had, the committee thinks it unprofitable to attempt to estimate. In any case it must point out that this tragic event was not a normal nor a foreseeable consequence of the new policy; and that it has therefore no relevance to the question of the wisdom of that policy.

Professor Webster's death, however, brought a further step in the realization of the new program. No successor was appointed to his chair, and work in physics leading to the doctorate was discontinued. Thus another of the older graduate departments disappeared.

8. *Department of Chemistry.*¹—From the time of the adoption of the new program the graduate department of chemistry had been a problem. Chemistry could not easily be regarded as an adjunct to geography, and the development and indefinite continuance of the department was therefore inconsistent with the policy adopted in 1920. On the other hand the department did not conform to the assumption upon which that policy, as explained by the chairman of the Board of Trustees, largely rested, *viz.*, that successful departments in laboratory subjects could not be maintained at Clark University; in point of fact, in about six years Dr. Kraus and his associates had, President Atwood has said, "through heroic efforts built up a very strong department." Its head, moreover, was not near the age of retirement. For a time, therefore, no steps towards the elimination of chemistry were taken; and Dr. Kraus states: "In the fall of 1922 the President requested that I make an estimate of the cost of an addition to the present chemical laboratory, which I did; and the same was presented to him and by him presumably was presented to the Board of Trustees early in 1923." Nothing more, however, was heard of this project; and in April, 1923 (at which time the department had more students preparing for the

¹ See President Atwood's statement concerning this department, Appendix B.

doctorate than any other in the University) President Atwood proposed to Professor Kraus that he relinquish entirely the work of teaching graduate students and devote himself solely to research. This proposal was accompanied by an offer of an increase in salary, and of a small annual sum for research assistance.¹ Professor Kraus regarded this proposal as "obviously impracticable," on the ground that the provision for research expenses was insufficient and that research in chemistry can best be prosecuted where there are a number of graduate students carrying on investigations related to those of the professors in charge. A conference was therefore held between Dr. Kraus, the president, and the chairman of the Board of Trustees, and an arrangement was reached whereby (testimony of Dr. Kraus) "the funds necessary to carry on the work in the department of chemistry were to be assured within definite limits, though expansion beyond this point was definitely cut off." The total amount provided was about the same as before except that the provision for fellowships was reduced to \$1000. Dr. Kraus further testifies:

At no time did I agree or suggest that I was willing to give up the work of training graduate students. I quote the following extracts from a letter which I wrote to President Atwood on May 25, setting forth my understanding of the agreement: "That. . . I may continue with the training of graduate students in connection with the research work of the laboratory in so far as the resources of the laboratory permit and in so far as appears to me to be wise." . . . In accepting the proposition, I felt that I had secured my position as a going graduate department and could continue my work of instruction and research without interference.

President Atwood, in a letter of June 18, answered Dr. Kraus that the items specified in his letter of May 25 were "all known to the Board of Trustees and have been agreed upon." Nevertheless in a statement published by the University on June 7, President Atwood, in dealing with "changes in the older departments established under the previous administration" said: "Certain special research laboratories may be maintained here. One has already been established in chemistry, where a few superior advanced students will be accepted."² This is not considered by Dr. Kraus, nor does it appear to the committee, to be an accurate statement of the arrangement agreed upon. In fact, the department of chemistry

¹ This proposal was made before the death of Professor Webster, and not after it as might be inferred from President Atwood's appended statement.

² A similar statement was made by the chairman of the Trustees: See Appendix D.

in the year after the adoption of the agreement was still one of the two largest in the University.

With respect to the duration of the agreement the following statement of his understanding was formulated in writing by Dr. Kraus and similarly accepted by the President on behalf of the Board of Trustees:

It was understood that the above appropriation [*i.e.*, the entire appropriation mentioned in the agreement] was to continue for an indefinite period of years while I continued in position as director of the laboratory, or until such time as by mutual agreement a revised plan for the laboratory was made.

Shortly after, however, two other members of the department of chemistry, Dr. B. S. Merigold and Dr. G. F. White, had an interview with President Atwood. Their oral testimony concerning this interview, given separately to the chairman of this committee at Worcester on February 16 and 15, 1924, in reply to interrogation, is as follows:

Dr. Merigold: I clearly remember that at an interview with President Atwood at which Dr. White was also present, Dr. Atwood said that it was not certain that the present arrangement for the support of the chemistry work could continue indefinitely. My very strong impression also is that President Atwood referred to five years as the period beyond which the continuance of the arrangement was questionable.

Dr. White: I distinctly remember that Dr. Atwood said, with reference to the laboratory appropriation mentioned in the agreement with Dr. Kraus: "You know this arrangement is for five years only."

This remark was reported to Dr. Kraus by his colleagues; it seemed to him to show that the President did not intend to keep the agreement so recently made, and he resolved to take the first opportunity to leave Clark University. Receiving shortly after a call to a professorship in Brown University, he presented his resignation to take effect at the end of the year 1923-24. It should be added that when the chairman of the committee visited Worcester, President Atwood declared himself to be at a loss to account for Professor Kraus' resignation and for his joining in the request for an inquiry by this Association.

The administrative methods thus employed in dealing with the department of chemistry deserve especial notice. They were, in the first place, curiously vacillating. The principles of the new policy, as set forth by the chairman of the trustees, required the

discontinuance of chemistry more clearly than of any other department, with the possible exception of physics, since chemistry is a relatively expensive laboratory subject, unrelated to geography, and well provided for in other universities; and whatever methods for the reduction of the department were to be adopted should have been promptly decided upon and as promptly communicated to Professor Kraus. If, on the other hand, it was felt that, in spite of the new policy, so strong a department could not be sacrificed, that decision should also have been promptly made and consistently adhered to. What, as has been shown, actually occurred was that for a time Dr. Kraus was given special encouragement, and that, nearly three years after the adoption of the new policy, plans for enlarging the chemical laboratory were under consideration; but that suddenly thereafter, with no change in the condition of the department, it was decided to eliminate the relatively numerous body of graduate students in chemistry and—as had already been proposed in the case of physics—to reduce the department to a research professorship. In view of Dr. Kraus' objections, this proposal in turn was abandoned, though public statements were made which were likely to be construed as meaning that it had been adopted—which statements also tended to discourage students in chemistry from coming to Clark. Finally, within a fortnight after a contractual arrangement which expressly assured the indefinite continuance of the department, within the limits of a fixed appropriation, had been entered into, the president spoke of that arrangement as not necessarily valid for more than a brief period, thereby naturally causing the head of the department to conclude that the administration of the University was acting in bad faith. That the president made the remark casually, and that at the moment he had forgotten the provisions of the agreement, is presumably the case—though a year later his recollection was clear that the agreement was a permanent one. But such lapses of memory on the part of administrative officers—whether concerning written contracts or their own oral statements—are likely to have extremely unfortunate consequences.

9. *Summary of Situation in Spring of 1923.*—Of the eight graduate departments existing in 1919-20, six had been either discontinued or apparently marked for discontinuance by June, 1923: biology, mathematics, physics, chemistry, psychology, social

science;¹ and it was generally understood that graduate work in pedagogy would cease with the approaching retirement of the head of that department. Of the eleven professors in the faculty of 1920, eight had been or were about to be separated from the University—two by retirement, one by death, and five by resignation. There had also been numerous changes in the lower grades of the teaching staff. Of the resignations of professorships four had been promoted by administrative acts or attitudes which had caused the professors in question to lose hope for the future of their departments and to feel distrust of the University administration. In the case of five and a half of the original departments—biology, mathematics, physics, chemistry, pedagogy, and experimental psychology—discontinuance was a logical implication of the policy of concentrating upon "geography." In the case of social science, history, and some phases of non-laboratory psychology, this was not so clearly the case; the difficulties in the two former departments seem to have been due chiefly to the generally disturbed situation, and especially to the president's resentment of criticisms arising out of the Nearing affair.

The cumulative result of the feeling aroused by this series of incidents was a violent outburst of criticism of the University administration. In the *Boston Transcript* of May 31, 1923, statements concerning the situation at Clark by Professors Boring, Barnes, Hankins, Pratt and Young were published, together with replies by Dr. Atwood and Dr. Thurber; and the public agitation thus initiated has, as noted at the outset, continued until the time of preparation of this report (July, 1924).

VII. RESULTS OF NEW POLICY AND OF METHODS OF NEW ADMINISTRATION

The committee has already remarked that the new plan, though at the time of its adoption the presumption against it was apparently decisive, should be finally judged by its results. It remains therefore to inquire concerning the situation in Clark University at the close of 1923-24, after four years of that policy and of the work of the new administration.

As a means of attracting a greater number of graduate students to the University, the new policy has thus far been unsuccessful. The last year before its adoption (as has been mentioned) the University

¹ The last two of these departments were not in the end discontinued.

had 75 graduate students (not including honorary fellows or special students). The corresponding figures for the last four years are: 1920-21, 51; 1921-22, 96; 1922-23, 53; 1923-24, 70, of whom only 46 are full-time students.¹ Of the total for the last year, 20 were in history, 17 in chemistry, 12 in education, 9 in geography, 9 in psychology.² In the distribution of graduate students' work by departments, 27% of the elections were in chemistry, 19% in history, 19% in psychology, 15% in education, and 8% in geography, the rest in various other subjects.³ Thus the department for the sake of which the troubles and disorganization of the past four years were incurred, and to the support of which 30% of the departmental expenditure is devoted, has fewer students than had in 1920 the departments which have been discontinued to enable it to be supported, and was in 1923-24 a poor fifth among the present departments in amount of graduate work elected. The general situation, then, with respect to graduate student attendance, is considerably worse than that of 1920, which Dr. Sanford characterized as "desperate"—especially in view of the fact that the department of chemistry, having about 25% of the total enrollment, will be virtually eliminated next year, with a material further loss of regular graduate students as the probable consequence.⁴

Of the interesting and impressive program outlined at President Atwood's inauguration for advanced instruction and research in geography only a small portion has thus far (1924) been carried out. The teaching staff in the subject consists of Dr. Atwood as professor of physical and regional geography; a distinguished specialist in anthropogeography, Dr. Ellen C. Semple, who spends one term in Worcester; an acting part-time professor of agricultural geography, an associate professor of meteorology and climatology, and an assistant professor of economic geography. The last two also give undergraduate and summer courses. There are in addition a lecturer on the pedagogy of geography, who is also director of correspondence courses, and three non-resident lecturers on the soils, the vegetation, and the forests, respectively, of North America. Thus, in addition

¹ Enrollment of regular graduate students for 1924-25 at end of second week of university year was 52.

² Of regular graduate students registered for 1924-25 (first term), 16 are in history, 13 in geography, 8 in psychology, 5 in economics, 4 in education, 3 in chemistry, 2 in physics, one in biology. The last three departments receive only candidates for the master's degree (one-year course) and are conducted by the college staff.

³ The Registrar of the University, to whom the committee applied for these last figures, was not permitted by President Atwood to communicate them. The committee has, however, been able to obtain the official data from other sources.

⁴ This, as above noted, has now occurred (Sept., 1924).

to Dr. Atwood, whose administrative duties as president of the University and College are considerable, the faculty of the School of Geography has two resident, full-time members who are specialists in the subject, both of these giving much time to undergraduate instruction.¹ While Clark now has what is unusual in American institutions, a distinct department competently equipped to give numerous courses, both graduate and undergraduate, in geography, it would not appear that, in point of number of professors, range and specialization of courses, and, especially, provision of time and of facilities for original investigation in the field, there has as yet been a close approach to the realization of the purpose of establishing at Worcester a school of geographical research "unique in America and pre-eminent in its special field" and of "developing for America a great bureau of information regarding conditions in this and other lands."

It will be noted that of the graduate departments of 1920 which still exist, history and the group consisting of psychology and education have (1923-24) more students and a much greater number of elections than geography. This seems to confirm the view that if the resources diverted to the establishment of a new department had been devoted to the strengthening of a group of the older ones, a healthier growth of the graduate school would have resulted. There are, indeed, indications that the program of "concentrating" definitely upon geography and kindred subjects is being abandoned, and that psychology, chiefly in its educational bearings, is likely again to be a subject especially emphasized at Clark University.² The University, in short, after four years' trial of the new plan, is reverting towards a policy of which the possibility and advisability were fairly obvious in 1920, and which could much more effectively and unimpededly have been adopted then than now. At present, the subjects in which university work is carried on by no means constitute a compact or "concentrated" group. Between physiography and mental hygiene or educational psychology, the scientific relations cannot be said to be close.

It should be understood that the foregoing statements refer only to what was meant by "Clark University" in 1920, *i.e.*, to the graduate departments. The committee has made no extended

¹ There are no material changes in the staff for 1924-25.

² This is partly due to a considerable bequest (\$175,000) "for research in genetic psychology" from the late President Hall. The reestablishment of the graduate department of psychology occurred, however, before Dr. Hall's death; and the greater part of the bequest will not accrue to the University for some time to come.

inquiry into conditions in the College, with which it is not primarily concerned; but a few words about this part of the institution may be added. Some important changes of policy have occurred. Until 1922, partly in consequence of a wish expressed in the will of the founder, an unusual and interesting plan was followed in undergraduate instruction at Clark. The normal period of residence for the bachelor's degree was fixed at three years, but in this period candidates were required to gain "credits" for 108 semester-hours, and students receiving an average grade of less than B- (82%) in the three years were required to take further work. In addition a "summer study plan" had been introduced, chiefly to "afford means of cultivating capacity for independent study" and to enable students to "complete the requirements for the bachelor's degree without carrying the full program of 18 hours per week through the college course." Under this plan "credits" were given for specified courses of reading followed by examinations or other tests; but the period of residence could not thereby be reduced to less than three years. Finally, "in order that the average student" might "work with as few distractions and as many advantages as possible," participation in intercollegiate athletics was forbidden, but especial attention was given to systematic physical training.¹ In the judgment of many of the faculty, as good educational results were attained under this plan as by the average four-year course. But "increasing pressure, on the one hand, for the admission of high-school graduates who could not qualify for the three-year course, and, on the other hand, for a larger development of extra-curricular activities, including athletics, led to a modification of this plan."² The normal term of residence was in 1922 increased to four years, and the required "credits" to 120 semester-hours, though "additional credits" are given to "the leading twenty-five per cent" in each class, making the degree attainable in three years by exceptional students. The plan of summer reading-courses has been discontinued. Encouragement is now given to intercollegiate athletics and to so-called "student activities;" an athletic field has been bought, and a dormitory erected out of a bequest left to the University unconditionally by a former member of the Board of Trustees.³ The character of the College has thus

¹ Foregoing citations in this paragraph are from *Annual Catalog*, 1920.

² *Catalogue*, 1923.

³ In June, 1924, the Student Body passed resolutions expressing its "full confidence" in President Atwood and his policies. A resolution critical of this action was subsequently passed by the senior class.

radically altered, chiefly during the past four years; the faculty, of course, shares responsibility with the president for some of these changes. Whether the "pressure" which led to these changes was irresistible, the committee is not in a position to judge; but it thinks the loss of the former unique character of Clark College, and the abandonment of an important educational experiment, regrettable. The changes have not increased the student attendance, which—in spite of the adoption of the practice of sending a recruiting agent to visit New England high schools—was approximately the same in 1923–24 as in 1919–20 and about 10 per cent less than in 1921–22.¹ The class entering in September, 1923, was about 30 per cent smaller than that of 1920.² Meanwhile, in spite of the increased number of courses required for the bachelor's degree, the total number giving undergraduate instruction has not increased,³ though most of the University faculty now also give College courses. Through this last change the distinction of the old Clark University, as an institution having a faculty devoted almost wholly to "university" work, disappears.

Other changes, due to the initiative of President Atwood, have been the establishment (without consultation with the faculty) of a six-weeks summer school, which in 1923 had 135 students; of "home-study courses in geography," for which college credits are given to non-resident students; and of the degree of Bachelor of Education "for teachers who complete about two years of college work following a two years' normal school course." For this degree "30 semester-hours credit may be allowed for home-study or extension courses" and all of the required resident work at Clark (equivalent to one year) may be done in the summer school. As requirements for a bachelor's degree these seem to the committee of questionable adequacy. The new developments mentioned, however much they may promote a wider diffusion of the educational service of the institution, seem to indicate the diversion of a large part of its energies and its resources into activities of a type quite different from those with which its name and reputation have hitherto been especially associated. If these new activities had been accompanied by a commensurate growth of graduate work and research they would give no special

¹ Enrollment of regular undergraduates for 1924–25 was 13% less than in 1921–22. Including special students, the total was about the same as in 1920.

² This remains approximately true of the freshman class entering in September, 1924.

³ At the beginning of 1924–25 the appointment of seven new members of the faculty is announced; of these, two have the doctor's degree. The total of undergraduate instructors appears to be now slightly greater than in 1920.

occasion for comment; but they have in fact been coincident with a decline in such work.

VIII. CONCLUSION

The committee will now sum up its opinion with respect to the more general and fundamental criticisms of recent educational policy and administrative methods at Clark University, made by the complainants, by other members and former members of the faculty of the University, and by a large number of its graduates.

The Board of Trustees of the University was confronted in 1920 with an undeniably difficult situation, in which, in the Committee's judgment, some further concentration and reorganization of the activities of the graduate school were desirable. The Board, however, disregarded several possible plans from which, as it seems to the Committee, good results might fairly confidently have been expected; and, without taking counsel with or even making its program clear to its faculty, it embarked upon an ambitious and difficult educational venture, which might, however, in itself—though not in all of the methods employed in it—be justified by success. Thus far it has not been justified by success; the committee is unable to dissent from the published opinion of the numerous body of alumni and former professors already mentioned, that the present position of the University (1923-24), with respect to its postgraduate departments, is inferior to that which it held in 1919-20, and that it has lost much of the character which once constituted its special distinction. This result is due partly to the nature of the new policy and partly to a series of grave administrative errors which have attended its execution; the nature and roots of these errors, this report will have made clear. How much of the outcome is attributable to the former of these causes, how much to the latter, the Committee sees no sure means of judging; the two factors cannot be isolated. With more judicious management the experiment would doubtless have had a smoother course and a more fortunate issue thus far. But that, even under more favorable auspices, it would have proved advantageous for Clark University to abandon the principle of continuity of development to which it was especially committed, to discard so great a part of its intangible assets, and, with very limited financial resources, to attempt to create, at the expense of existing depart-

ments, a wholly new school in a large and costly field of study, the committee believes to be improbable.

In this enterprise the University appears to have been involved through the enthusiasm of a small number of members of a lay board of trustees. The entire episode is perhaps chiefly significant as showing how—under a form of government not peculiar to Clark—the policy of an institution may be abruptly revolutionized by a very few men not of the teaching profession, the faculty, as well as the alumni, being treated as a body having no concern in the matter. The unhappy results which followed in this instance were in part due to the effect of this treatment upon the relations of the trustees, and of the president chosen to carry out their policy, on the one hand, and the educational staff, on the other. The faculties of American universities are not now content to be negligible factors in the determination of educational policies; and that is one, though not the chief, reason why it is inexpedient to regard them as such. Peculiar to Clark, however, was a further feature of its organization especially well adapted to cause difficulties—that whereby a single department head, chiefly engrossed with the work and the interests of his own department, was given control over the fortunes of the other departments, whose representatives were not even authorized to communicate with the Board of Trustees except through him. That in a small institution an active head of a department should also be president is perhaps a desirable arrangement, and certainly is a plan worth trying—but only upon condition that the faculty participate in his election, that he be regarded simply as *primus inter pares*, and that all matters of policy, appointments, etc., be threshed out by a broadly representative faculty body of which the president is chairman—a body without whose counsel he is not at liberty to take any measures of importance. An institution like Clark University, with a small faculty of high standing, is peculiarly fitted for such cooperative government by the group of scholars composing it, under a leader at least partly of their own choosing; and it is peculiarly unfitted for the system which has hitherto obtained there.

The situation at Clark University has been further complicated by By-Law III, which provides that members of the faculty, collectively as well as individually, may communicate with the Board of Trustees only through the president. If this means merely that the president should know of all such communications and that they should be

transmitted through his hands without modification, it is not open to serious objection, but if it means that the faculty have no assured way of laying their views before the Trustees under any circumstances except at the president's discretion, or that his statements to the Trustees are presumed to represent the judgment of the faculty, the rule is a dangerous one. It is apparently interpreted at Clark University in the latter sense; for in his appended statement President Atwood justifies the adoption of the new policy in 1920 wholly without the faculty's knowledge on the ground that the then president was consulted and that, "under the plan of organization here at Clark," the president "represented the faculty in all negotiations with the Trustees." This seems to the committee an unusual and unconvincing conception of faculty representation; and its practical effect is to keep the Trustees more or less in ignorance of the real situation in the University. That such a plan is now breaking down even in industrial and commercial establishments would appear to indicate that it is unsuitable for an organization of professional workers. It is the opinion of the committee that the recent history of Clark University shows that the amendment of this By-Law would be in the University's interest.

Of President Atwood it is to be said that, in consenting to become the executant of the new policy, he undertook a difficult and embarrassing task in which, in the nature of the case, criticism and opposition were inevitable. It was a task demanding not only energy and sincere enthusiasm for the science of geography (both of which he has abundantly manifested), but also a high degree of tact, administrative wisdom, coolness and good humor under opposition, fairness in controversy, and ability to see other men's points of view; and these qualities he has apparently been unable to command. One of the gifts most requisite in an administrative officer is the power to foresee the natural reactions of other men to his own programs and measures; President Atwood's lack of this seems to the committee to be most plainly shown in his genuine surprise and anger at the opposition which the new policy, and various specific acts of his own, aroused. The charge that he is indifferent to scientific research as such does not seem to the committee to be established; it was a necessary consequence of the new policy that this impression should be produced in the minds of members of those departments not favored by that policy. On the other hand it is true that his administration has been

more distinguished by the addition of a summer school, correspondence courses, an athletic field and a dormitory, than by the condition of the research-activities of the University. The establishment, in an institution having a very small faculty, of a summer school manned chiefly from its own staff, and the requirement of a larger number of undergraduate courses per teacher, are measures unfavorable to productive scientific work in such an institution. Dr. Atwood has, however, introduced a plan of sabbatical leaves which should in the future do something to offset the bad effects of these measures. He has, also, cooperated with the faculty in increasing the requirements for the A.B. and higher degrees. The most serious criticisms to be brought against his administration relate to qualities and tendencies sufficiently indicated elsewhere in this report, which it does not appear needful to attempt to characterize further.

Concerning the future the committee is not called upon to predict; but it thinks it important to add that it does not see in the recent history of this university proof of any intrinsic impossibility of maintaining successfully the type of institution which it represents—*i.e.*, a graduate school not associated with a large undergraduate college and covering only a limited range of studies. As an institution of this type Clark University was at its outset an important and unique educational experiment; but the experiment has been hampered by unfavorable conditions not inherent in its nature. It is true that such institutions must inevitably have certain special difficulties to meet. They are, for example, handicapped by certain unfortunate tendencies of American graduate students—the absence of the custom of migration after graduate work has begun, and the disposition to pursue postgraduate study in the same institution in which the student has taken his first degree. Again, where the staffs of departments are necessarily small, the problem of departmental rejuvenescence and of keeping up with the progress of rapidly changing and expanding sciences may sometimes prove especially difficult. On the other hand, such institutions, if wisely organized and conducted, have great compensatory advantages, both for research and instruction; one of the greatest, in the latter respect, is that they should be less likely to confuse the distinctive problems and methods of collegiate and university work. Where these advantages are effectively utilized, there is no reason to doubt that they will attract graduate students of the best type in considerable numbers

and make for a vigorous *esprit de corps* and an especially keen enthusiasm for research. Certain fundamental principles which may well guide a university of this type were set forth in the statement of policy adopted by the original Board of Trustees of Clark University:

The settled policy of the University shall be always to first strengthen departments already established until they are as thorough, as advanced, as special, and as efficient as possible, before proceeding to the establishment of new ones. . . . When new departments are established, those shall always be chosen first which are scientifically most closely related to departments already established, that the body of sciences here represented may be kept vigorous and compact, and that the strength of the University may always rest, not upon the number of subjects nor upon the length and breadth of its curriculum, but upon its thoroughness and its unity. . . . While ability in teaching shall be held of great importance, the leading consideration in all engagements, reappointments and promotions shall be the quality and quantity of successful investigation.

The primary cause of the recent difficulties and present condition of this university lay in the abandonment of these principles.

The Committee has carefully explored and, to the best of its ability, accurately described the facts of the disturbed situation at Clark University, and has stated regretfully its serious conclusions. In thus performing the duty assigned to it the Committee hopes that its report may aid in clarifying public opinion, and that it may in no way retard, but definitely promote, the welfare of the University and the more effectual realization of the ends for which the University exists and to which it has in the past rendered notable service.

Respectfully submitted:

ARTHUR O. LOVEJOY, *Chairman*
(Johns Hopkins University),

JOHN M. BREWER
(Harvard University),

ROBERT K. ROOR
(Princeton University),

HENRY S. WHITE
(Vassar College).¹

APPENDIX A

APPLICATION FOR INVESTIGATION

We, the undersigned, have requested the American Association of University Professors to investigate the academic situation at Clark University for the reason that we believe that the present policy of the President and of the Board

¹ Professor E. A. Ross was originally a member of the committee, but has been prevented by absence abroad from participating in the drafting of the report.

of Trustees at Clark University is subversive of educational progress and in some respects not in accordance with the best ethical principles. Our criticisms of the present administration of Clark University are set forth below.

(1a) The Board of Trustees established the Department of Geography in contravention of their By-Laws which had been in effect since 1889 and which, according to the catalog of 1920, were in effect at the time that the Department of Geography was established;

(b) The Board of Trustees applied a large portion of the income of the University to the newly established Department of Geography and thereby made impossible the further growth and even the continued existence of then existing departments;

(c) The Faculty of the University were left in ignorance and even misled as to the true policy of the Administration, which policy was not made known to them or to the public at large until the spring of 1923, three years after its inception.

(2) The President acquiesced in the action of the Board of Trustees in establishing the new Department of Geography in contravention of the By-Laws of the Board; he made no announcement of the policy of the Administration; and he allowed existing departments to die out without making any effort to maintain them, as was his first duty according to the By-Laws.

(3a) The policy of the Administration to concentrate the resources of the University on a single department (Geography) at the expense of other already established departments is unsound from an educational point of view. The School of Geography in Clark University has not been able to make for itself a position in the scientific and academic world which measurably offsets the loss due to the disintegration of previously existing departments;

(b) The funds diverted to the use of the Department of Geography constituted a large fraction of the total income of the University available for research purposes, and, according to the admission of the Administration, made necessary the elimination or, at any rate, the limitation of the work of other departments. But, while other departments were thus handicapped, the funds allotted to Geography were more than was required for the proper maintenance of Geography at the time. It appears that the balance was allowed to remain idle or accumulate rather than to employ it to meet the pressing needs of other departments. Such action on the part of the Administration was an act of discrimination against other existing departments, which not only unnecessarily weakened the work in those departments but also tended to destroy the morale of the graduate faculty.

(4a) While the affairs of the University required the whole-hearted, disinterested and intelligent leadership of a qualified administrator, the President was engrossed with the affairs of the Department of Geography and seemed at all times to approach the problems of the University with impatience; there can be little doubt that in his estimation the interests of his own Department were paramount to those of the University as a whole;

(b) The policy of combining the headship of a newly established department with the presidency of the whole University was unsound. The reorganization of the University and the College as a single institution and its further administration and the establishment of a new department each required the undivided attention of a responsible head. The dual functions of one and the same individual as president of the University and as head of a department represent mutually conflicting interests and the combined arrangement places other departments on an unequal footing with that department (Geography).

(5) The morale of the student body, the alumni, and the faculty was destroyed through the lack of tact and through the temperamental disqualification of the President.

(Signed)

EDWIN G. BORING,
F. H. HANKINS,
HARRY E. BARNES,
CHARLES A. KRAUS.

APPENDIX B

REPLY OF PRESIDENT ATWOOD

March 4, 1924.

DEAR PROFESSOR LOVEJOY:

After reading the petition signed by Professors Boring, Hankins, Barnes and Kraus, addressed to the American Association of University Professors and requesting an investigation of the academic situation at Clark University and the present policy of the President and Board of Trustees, I have decided in response to your request to make the following statement for publication in full:

1. *Relative to By-Laws.* The By-Laws referred to in the petition are some that were adopted by the Board of Trustees about the time of the establishment of the University. They have never been so interpreted by the Board as to prevent the closing of departments or the establishment of new departments. The history of the University shows that there was for a number of years a graduate Department of Anthropology here and that was closed ten years ago. For a number of years graduate work in chemistry, provided for early in the history of the institution, was discontinued and later the department was reopened. In 1904 provision was made for the opening of Departments of History and Economics as well as Modern Languages and English in the Graduate School. The provision for modern languages and English was long ago abandoned but work in history and economics has been continued. Two of the men who have signed this petition were directly benefited by the establishment of history and economics in the Graduate School, and a third by the reestablishment of the Chemistry Department.

The appropriations for most of the existing departments have been increased during the present administration and no curtailments were made until through retirement on account of age, or voluntary retirement or withdrawal, the personnel in certain departments was decreased. More detailed information relative to changes in departments will appear under (5) below.

2. *Spirit of research dominant at Clark.* There has never been any intention of reducing the amount or lowering the character of graduate work at Clark. However, concentration upon work in a few departments continues to characterize the policy in the Graduate Division of the University. Under the founder's will the funds available for graduate work cannot be transferred to any other use and it is moreover the purpose and desire of the trustees, as well as that of the president, to maintain and develop this side of the institution's work. The very men who have signed the petition have as members of the Graduate Board cooperated with me in the revision of the requirements for admission and for graduate degrees here at Clark, and know that we have established standards in accordance with the best practices obtaining in the graduate schools in the Association of American Universities. Two of the petitioners were members of the committee which I appointed for that work. Their correspondence with me, and their remarks at the board meetings indicated that they were heartily and even enthusiastically supporting the administration in this program.

3. *President has always given instruction at Clark.* It has always been the custom at Clark for the president of the University to be actively identified with the work in one of the graduate departments of instruction. The administrative work in the College is now delegated, for the most part, to the dean of the College who works in cooperation with the Collegiate Board.

4. *The new plans were promptly announced.* It is absurd for any member of the faculty of this University who attended my inaugural exercises, or read my inaugural address, to hold that the policy of the new administration was not made known. I will quote from my inaugural address as follows:

"After a careful study of the needs in higher education in this country the Trus-

tees of Clark University adopted plans which, if successfully carried out, will lead to the development in Clark University of a department unique in America and preeminent in its special field. It will be a department which should help to fill a real gap in our educational system, and make important contributions to the work of all schools in America. It will be a department where a large part of the resources available and a large part of the energy of the staff will be devoted to the promotion of research work and productive scholarship. It should enrich the cultural values in education and make important contributions bearing upon industrial and commercial problems and upon many other national and international problems before the adult citizenship of the United States.

"In addition to the regular collegiate courses and to graduate work in certain of the strong departments for research already established, we shall offer to teachers, to men entering large business enterprises, especially international trade, to all those who wish to enter consular or diplomatic service, special facilities in the study of geography. It will be our policy to establish and develop a graduate school in geography; a school with a staff of experts who must become familiar with the geography of the different parts of the world; not entirely home-made experts, but experts who, by means of frequent visits, active correspondence, and constant study of a given portion of this earth, keep up to date in their knowledge of the actual conditions in the different countries."¹

The following statement was made by the President of the Board of Trustees at the inaugural exercises and appears in the same publication as the inaugural address just referred to, pages 4 and 5:

"It is not necessary that this institution, founded as an innovation, shall cherish forever each and every detail that has found a place in its organization; but it is absolutely necessary that Clark shall be true to certain great fundamental principles; and of these two stand out conspicuously.

"The true university spirit must forever be maintained. That spirit is the spirit of truth. It requires both the historical and the experimental disciplines: the one to make clear the truth we have to build on; the other to go forward from what we have and annex ever more and more of the undiscovered country. Our second great principle is like unto and grows out of our first, for the explorer cannot sit by the old hearthstone. Clark University started one innovation in offering graduate courses only; Clark College started another in its three years' course. This institution must never lose the courage and the spirit of the pioneer. To our new president, who has spent much of his life in exploring the lonely mountains and wind-swept plains of our great West, we look with assurance to lead us ever onward to new frontiers."

5. *Changes in certain departments.* From your letter I should judge that you are genuinely interested in what has transpired relative to certain of the graduate departments here at Clark and I assume that other members of your committee and of the Association will also be interested and I will, therefore, sketch briefly the facts relative to certain of the departments in which considerable changes have occurred during the present administration.

Biology. When I came to Clark, Professor Lillie, who was working alone in graduate biology, was considering a call to the Nela Laboratories at a much higher salary. It was an opportunity to pursue pure research work under most favorable conditions and we cordially talked over the whole situation. There had been no candidates in biology for the Ph.D. degree since 1913. There was, however, one man working with Dr. Lillie, who anticipated taking the degree in 1921. That man needed no further instructional work, and Dr. Lillie indicated that he could direct his thesis work at a distance. When Dr. Lillie accepted the call to the Nela Laboratories we were forced to consider the question as to what we should do for graduate work in biology. There was a total appropriation of about \$4500, and I considered that sum altogether too small for remanning and maintaining

¹ Special Publication: Inauguration of Wallace Walter Atwood. Clark University Library, page 35.

a graduate School in Biology, to which students should be invited to come and complete their training for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Mathematics. Dr. Story retired on account of age in 1921; Professor Taber on account of ill health requested that arrangements be made for his retirement; and Mr. Perott at the age of sixty-seven, who was doing a little lecturing in the department, requested that if possible I arrange for his retirement. There had been no candidates for the Ph.D. degree in mathematics during the previous four years, and but three since 1911. There were at that time a few who were interested in working for Master's degrees in mathematics. They were local school teachers and came over late in the afternoon. Dr. Arthur Gordon Webster kindly offered to complete the instruction which they needed. With the existing schedules of salaries obtaining in the best graduate schools of this country, the entire amount available for mathematics in the graduate budget was not more than enough to call one first-class man in mathematics. With the establishment of many strong departments of mathematics in neighboring universities, and especially with the great development of applied mathematics in the schools of technology here in New England and elsewhere, I concluded that it was unwise to recommend that we endeavor at present to compete in the field of graduate mathematics.

Physics. This was another one-man department. Professor Webster was deeply disturbed because he did not have graduate students, but in our many conversations I always took the position with him that he should not worry about the lack of students but go ahead with his research work. His position was absolutely assured and the appropriation for his laboratory was maintained without question throughout the time he was with us. The biographical sketch by Professor Edwin H. Hall, published in *Science*, July 29, 1923, contains a clear diagnosis of Professor Webster's mental condition which is known to have been due to a definite and fatal illness. The facts known to many and appreciated by Dr. Webster's best friends in the profession make some of the statements that appeared soon after his death a dishonorable record for those who caused their publication.

Fortunately we are in a position with the able physicists who were on the college staff to provide work leading to the degree of Master of Arts in Physics, and that for the present will be our policy.

Chemistry. This department was reopened for graduate work in 1907. Dr. Kraus was called in 1914 and through heroic efforts, and the cooperation of Dr. White and Dr. Merigold, he built up a very strong department. The salary for Dr. Kraus has been increased by a thousand dollars during the present administration and the appropriations for his laboratory have been increased each year during this administration. Without provision for full graduate work in physics, or mathematics, the position of graduate chemistry was naturally affected unfavorably. Nevertheless, it was the desire of the trustees and of the president to encourage Dr. Kraus just as far as it was possible. We could see that it would be impossible to carry out plans for a large teaching organization in graduate chemistry, and, therefore, a plan for a research laboratory was evolved. This plan was worked out in joint conference with the President of the University, the President of the Board of Trustees, and Professor Kraus. The proposal was received most enthusiastically by Dr. Kraus, and after careful consideration he asked for a somewhat larger appropriation for the research laboratory. This was granted, and all of the conditions which Dr. Kraus stipulated were agreed to by the Board of Trustees in the establishment of the laboratory. It was provided that he could have if he chose a limited number of high-grade students to be selected by himself but he would have been free to conduct the laboratory as a research institution and give no instruction if that had been his wish. His salary was raised and the appropriation granted for this work was greater than any he had ever before received for research. The permanency of the provisions for the laboratory was assured and put into contractual form. A few weeks

after the conference Dr. Kraus received and accepted, without consultation with me, a call from Brown University.

At present we anticipate organizing the staff and work in chemistry so that we may properly invite graduate students, candidates for the Master's degree, to continue with us.

Psychology. Psychology had always been the outstanding, large and conspicuous department here at Clark, and we all appreciate that it was due to the superior scholarship and leadership of the intellectual founder of the University, Dr. G. Stanley Hall. It was the expressed policy of the present administration not in any way to curtail that department but to assist it in every way possible. In the spring of 1922, when Dr. Boring was considering positions both at Harvard and Stanford and his reappointment would have normally come before the Board of Trustees at Clark, Dr. Sanford told me before the meeting of the Board at which such recommendations for reappointment were to be made that Dr. Boring had accepted a call to Harvard. With Dr. Sanford's recommendation we have since 1922 appointed three new men in psychology, one of them is now on our staff and another will begin work at Clark in the fall of 1924. We recognize the asset which Clark has in its enviable reputation in the training of psychologists, in its remarkable laboratory equipment for experimental work, and in the special library which has been provided during the last thirty-five years in psychology and education. Furthermore, we recognize that there are fields of work in psychology especially well represented in Dr. Carl Murchison's studies and instruction that are closely related to the group of humanistic studies now being developed at this University. With history and international relations strong, with the development of studies in world economics, sociology, and geography, the development of the social and national phases of psychology are most appropriate for graduate students interested in any one of these fields of thought.

6. *The financial problem.* Clark University has had no substantial increase to its endowment fund since the death of the founder. In those twenty years many strong graduate schools have been established in this country. The original plan started thirty-five years ago, of a group of graduate departments with one eminent authority in each field, has been entirely outgrown in America, and plans for the reorganization of Clark were known to be necessary. Dr. Hall has frankly acknowledged to me that he was not in the least surprised at the changes which had occurred since his resignation. He anticipated that many of them must take place. Furthermore, the salary schedule needed immediate attention, and with the hearty cooperation of the Board of Trustees the salary of every member of the faculty has been increased. The maximum is now \$1000 over the maximum of three years ago, and some members of the staff have had increases of more than that amount. Plans for annuities have been adopted and put into operation, and quite recently a plan has been adopted which provides that each member of the faculty of professorial rank shall have a semester off, on full pay, after each six years of service.

7. *Policy of concentration.* While competition in graduate fields of instruction and research could not be maintained in as many departments as heretofore, yet the prospects for constructive work in a selected group of departments were excellent. In formulating a plan for concentration the trustees very wisely took into consideration the fact that the founder of this University had provided an unusually large endowment for the library. With the depreciation in the buying power of the dollar it had become increasingly evident that the University could best support graduate work for which the equipment could be largely supplied by the library funds.

We have strengthened the Department of History and International Relations, and also the Department of Economics and Sociology. There are now five men giving instruction in these fields, and each one is capable of, and is conducting, high-grade graduate work.

8. *The School of Geography.* The establishment of the School of Geography was all planned for before the change was made in the administration, and with

the full knowledge and approval of Dr. G. Stanley Hall who, by the plan of organization here at Clark, represented the faculty in all negotiations with the Trustees. Geography was selected because it was recognized that in this country we have most seriously neglected this field of study and research in higher education. Just at the time when our nation was being necessarily brought into closer and closer contact with the affairs of the world, the conception most naturally developed for a type of geographical institute similar to those established in Europe, or a school of geography such as is organized in several of the European universities. This School should serve in this country as a center for the training of those who would enter the profession, or would enter governmental service, or commercial life, or who wish to contribute through research to our knowledge of geography. The movement during the last twenty-five years has been so notably towards human geography, meaning a knowledge of the actual conditions under which people are living, or the factor of environment in the interpretation of history, economics, or sociology, and international problems, that the time was ripe for some university to give special attention to this field of study.

The establishment of a School of Geography at Clark evoked no audible protest until the spring of 1922 when I requested the President of an undergraduate Liberal Club to close a meeting. Many of the faculty and the retiring president had endorsed the new program most enthusiastically. I have letters showing enthusiastic support of the new plans from two of the men who have signed the petition. I will quote from a letter from Dr. Barnes dated May 6, 1921—"I can assure you that your personal courtesy and constructive attitude towards the future of Clark make it a pleasure for a member of the faculty to cooperate in a hearty and cordial manner;" and from another letter from Dr. Barnes dated October 20, 1921—"I fully realize that the history department has been specially favored and that within the department I have received consideration which is somewhat beyond that which a man of my age could normally expect. My desire was rather to state concretely what was needed in our department if we were to meet in an adequate manner the demands for instruction in history which now exist at Clark. I feel that right now at Clark University there is an opportunity to build up a graduate school around geography and the social sciences which will command public attention and attract students in a degree out of all proportion to the relative size of the faculty which we can gather within the limitations of our financial resources."

Since the establishment of the School, fourteen American colleges and universities have called upon this department for well-trained specialists. We have placed our graduates in first-class positions, and we cannot yet meet the demand. The movement is one in which Clark may hope to render a service to American education, and Dr. Hall has very often encouraged me with the statement that it seemed to him that there is an opportunity in the development and promotion of the study of geography in this country comparable to that which there was for him thirty-five years ago when he developed child study and psychology at Clark. It is, therefore, with the same spirit of experimental work, of pioneer work in science and education, that the entire organization now at Clark in a spirit of cordial cooperation moves forward and will continue to move forward.

Respectfully yours,
W. W. Atwood.

APPENDIX C

LETTER OF PROFESSOR MURCHISON

February 13, 1924.

Dear Professor Lovejoy:

As a member of the faculty and as a friend of Clark University I am assuming the privilege of addressing a letter to you, the Chairman of the special committee

appointed by the Association of University Professors to investigate the validity of certain charges brought formally by Messrs. Barnes, Boring, Hankins, and Kraus. I desire that the contents of this letter be considered formally by your Committee.

In order to reduce the length of the letter and present its arguments in simple form, the original documents upon which the letter is based are reproduced and numbered as inclosures, and will be referred to by number after being designated.

Inclosure 1 is a copy of the original declarations concerning the policy of the institution; Inclosure 2 is a copy of the original statement concerning the duties of the President; Inclosure 3 is a copy of the General Statements which elaborated further the duties of the President; Inclosure 4 is a copy of the ten By-Laws, which still further elaborated the duties of the President,—being substituted for the General Statements; while Inclosure 5 is a copy of By-Law 7, which was later added to the ten,—making eleven By-Laws. The various Inclosures carry their own dates and references.

Original declarations concerning the policy of the institution. These two declarations occur, the first in the Preliminary Announcement of April 17, 1889, and the second in the First Official Announcement of May 23, 1889. The former states clearly that "this preliminary limitation of the wide academic field indicates no bias and no restriction of ulterior plans," while the latter states no less clearly that "new measures, and even innovations, if really helpful to the highest needs of modern science and culture, be no less freely adopted." These original statements or declarations might be considered the Constitution of Clark University, while the By-Laws might be considered as rules, added to from time to time, for attaining the purposes of the original declarations.

History of the By-Laws. Inclosure 2 is a copy of the original phrases which later became elaborated more and more into additional statements. The phrases, of which Inclosure 2 is a copy, are to be found in all catalogs of the university from 1889 till 1920. In the Second Official Statement of May, 1890, on page 10, it is stated that the duties of the President are now more fully defined by By-Laws enacted by the corporation on September 26, 1889. But such By-Laws are published in the same Official Statement on pages 12-13 under the heading of General Statements, and are published only in that form in the Third and Fourth Official Statements. In the Fifth Official Announcement of May, 1893, on pages 51-53, there is the first publication of By-Laws under the heading of By-Laws, and there are ten in number. Thus the By-Laws are greatly increased in number above those previously published under General Statements. In the Fourteenth Official Announcement of March, 1902, the number of By-Laws is increased to eleven, by the addition of the By-Law that was numbered 7 thereafter. The eleven By-Laws appeared in each catalog till 1921, when their publication was discontinued.

Departments: Clark University began in 1889 with five departments: Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, Biology and Psychology. In 1894, the department of Chemistry was closed, but was carried in the catalog till 1901. For the following three years, the catalog of the University showed only four departments. The Seventeenth Official Announcement for March 1905, showed ten

graduate departments: Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, Biology, Anthropology, Psychology, Education, Economics and Sociology, History and Modern Languages. The Eighteenth Official Announcement for February, 1906, added English, making eleven departments. The Nineteenth Official Announcement for March, 1907, omits Modern Languages and English, reducing the departments to nine. The Twenty-seventh Official Announcement for January, 1915, omitted Anthropology, upon the death of Doctor Chamberlain, reducing the departments to eight.

Against whom can indictment for nonobservance of By-Law One be brought? That part of By-Law One concerning the establishment of new departments has never been observed here at Clark. When the new department of Geography was established at Clark, it was no more of an innovation than was the establishment of Economics and Sociology, History, Modern Languages, and other departments during President Hall's administration. The Trustees responsible for the passage of By-Law One are all dead, and the present Trustees, according to By-Law Ten (later called Eleven), have the power to repeal or modify any By-Law. In fact, the establishment of Geography might be considered as in line with the traditions of the institution.

Which status quo is being defended? Which status quo of Clark University is the real one? That of 1889, 1902, 1905, 1906, 1907, 1915, or 1920? No two of these are identical. Unless the gentlemen who are bringing the indictment can indicate which is the real status quo of the seven that have existed prior to 1921, they must admit the validity of the changes.

President and head of department. The situation in which the President is Head of the Geography Department is not a new and peculiar situation at Clark. The first President of Clark College, Carroll D. Wright, was also Head of the Department of Economics and Sociology, a department established for him.

Relation of Messrs. Barnes, Boring, Hankins, and Kraus to the By-Laws. Doctor Barnes and Doctor Hankins were both members of departments at Clark that were established in 1905 contrary to By-Law One. Neither of them could ever have been associated with Clark, if By-Law One had been complied with by the old administration. If the Board has broken faith on account of the nonobservance of By-Law One, then Messrs. Barnes and Hankins must admit that they themselves were party to a fraud while serving on the Clark Faculty.

If we accept the status quo of 1902 as the real Clark University, and since By-Law One was published in the catalog of that year, Doctor Kraus came to Clark because By-Law One was not complied with. In addition, by signing the indictment which has been presented to your Committee, he is violating the provisions of By-Law Three in not presenting a copy of the indictment to the President to be presented to the Trustees.

I have presented the above facts in the interest of fair play. If the four gentlemen above mentioned were not acquainted with these facts, their negligence is incomprehensible. If they were acquainted with these facts, the items of their indictment become even more amazing.

Very sincerely yours,

CARL MURCHISON.

(474)

INCLOSURE 1

Preliminary announcement, Worcester, April 17, 1889, p. 1.

"The work at Clark University will begin in October next, in the following departments: Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, Biology, and Psychology, with such additional facilities for the study of languages as scientific students may require. This preliminary limitation of the wide academic field indicates no bias and no restriction of ulterior plans, but is adopted in the interests of more effective organization. These departments will be gradually organized and sustained on the highest plane possible in existing conditions."

First official announcement, May 23, 1889, p. 4.

"His desire. . . that all available experience, both of older countries and our own, be freely utilized, and that new measures, and even innovations, if really helpful to the highest needs of modern science and culture, be no less freely adopted." (This latter refers to the desire of Mr. Clark, the founder.)

INCLOSURE 2

President.—(G. Stanley Hall) The duties of this office were defined by the Trustees, May 23, 1889, as follows:

"The President of the University shall consult frequently with the Trustees on all matters which concern the welfare of the University, and attend the meetings of the Board. He shall confer with each instructor concerning the development of his department, determine the duties and authority of each, and preside at the meetings of the faculty. He shall be the authorized medium of communication between the Board of Trustees and the officers of instruction, individually and collectively, in all matters involving the administration of the University. The enactments of the Board concerning instructors and their work, and all requests, complaints and proposals from the Faculty to the Trustees, shall be made known through him. He shall exercise or provide such superintendence over buildings, apparatus, books and other property as will secure their protection and appropriate use. Expenditures must not be ordered by any instructor of the University without his previous consent, or the express authority of the Board.

These duties were more fully defined by By-Laws enacted by the corporation, September 26, 1889." [Pertinent parts of other inclosures are cited in text of report.]

APPENDIX D

STATEMENT MADE BY DR. CHARLES H. THURBER, PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES (JUNE 7, 1923)

When Dr. Hall resigned an era came to an end. The future was a great problem. There were only three psychologists in America who might have been able to bring to the department of psychology personal prestige comparable to that of Dr. Hall. One of these men the trustees knew could not be brought to Clark. The other two were approached and gave the matter careful consideration, but preferred to stay in the notable positions they were holding. Dr. Atwood was approached and interested on the basis of building up a department of geography.

The time seemed opportune for that venture. Never was geographic training in such demand, no other subject was so inadequately recognized in American universities. The matter was carefully considered. Many opinions were taken. Finally the trustees were unanimously convinced that to call Dr. Atwood as president and professor of geography was the greatest service they could render to the university.

To be sure this meant a new department, a department however, that was closely correlated with history and international relations, already strong at Clark. Here was a new group, geography, history, international relations, economics, the newer and larger social sciences, which would depend chiefly on the library for their material. This was very important, for the library endowment is relatively large. The departments of natural science require large expenditures for laboratory work, and this money can come only from the general university fund. Concentration on departments that were already provided for as to material supplies was just common sense.

It was also necessary. Clark has four endowments, under Mr. Clark's will, one for the university, one for the college, one for the library and one for art. The income from each of these endowments must be used for the purpose specified; there can be no transferring of income from one department to another. So it happens that the library is fairly well off, but college and university are poor. Very little money has come to the university to add to Mr. Clark's original gifts. Now what has happened as to costs? Salaries have been raised at Clark to the full extent of its resources.

The total amount available annually to run Clark University, that is, the graduate school as distinct from the college, is about \$60,000 a year. Many an American university spends far more than that on a single department. And yet university work must be maintained at Clark, for there is a separate endowment for that purpose which can be used for nothing else. No department in the university could be respectable unless a sufficient salary could be paid to hold a first-class man.

What to do? Maintain a lot of graduate departments, cheaply manned, become a pariah among universities, or concentrate on the few things that could be done well centering as much of the work as possible about the good library? The choice was easy to make; it does not seem as though any one with common sense could question it. The distinguished head of the department of chemistry was made a research professor, and hereafter will have only a very few select students for whom ample provision is to be made. This is a new departure in American education, one of far-reaching importance, deserving more space than can be given it here. Nobody has been dismissed, but certain graduate departments that had declined were not revived. The future at Clark holds few university departments, but these are all to be of such quality as to add lustre to the university and enlarge its service to the world. With the great natural science departments in our large universities we cannot compete. So we shall not entice students to Clark by holding out false promises. Whenever the money is forthcoming new departments may be added, or old departments revived. It should not be forgotten that the department of chemistry was closed for years; it was

strong, it was closed, it was reopened and became strong again. Nothing is happening at Clark for which there is not ample precedent in Clark's history.

The trustees feel that Dr. Atwood in his three years as president has advanced the program on which the University is working with remarkable success.

A word about Clark College may properly be added. By Mr. Clark's will, it was provided that the organization of the College and University should be distinct, provided that when Dr. Hall retired from the presidency of the University the two institutions might be consolidated. With the coming of President Atwood this consolidation was accomplished. A great deal has been done in three years to strengthen the College. Apparently there is no unfavorable criticism on this branch of the institution. The salaries have been increased throughout, good results have been secured by the breaking down of dividing lines between the University and College faculties, and the general development of the collegiate department has gone on steadily. As pointed out above, there is a certain definite income which must be spent on this department. This income will be so used that its full value may be realized in strengthening the undergraduate work and adding to the value of the Clark bachelor's degree.

The trustees know President Atwood's motives, they know the man. They know that next year there will be no better-manned and equipped department of geography in the world than the one at Clark, they know that the policy of concentration is the only possible policy, they know that this policy is being so carried out as to utilize to the full such resources as the University has, they are as loyal today in their support of the president as they were when they called him to his great task, and they have no fear as to the future.

APPENDIX E

RESOLUTIONS OF ALUMNI IN ATLANTIC STATES, 1924

WHEREAS, the alumni of Clark University resident in the Atlantic States, having learned through reports of faculty and students, magazine and newspaper articles and other sources of the results of the new academic policy at Clark University; and

WHEREAS, it seems evident to them that the present administration has been unable to maintain the confidence of the faculty, the students and the general public interested in education; and

WHEREAS, the institution has already lost some of its ablest and most promising instructors and can with increasing difficulty attract teachers of high attainment and advanced students of serious purpose; and

WHEREAS, the academic reputation of the university has steadily declined since the present administration assumed control, until at present the worth of a degree from Clark is itself imperiled; and

WHEREAS, the present administration appears totally indifferent to the history and traditions of Clark University and is wantonly and unnecessarily sacrificing the academic prestige, the good-will earned through years of accomplishment and the spirit of enlightened and earnest scholarship which has always characterized Clark University; and

WHEREAS, the present administration is unavoidably aligning the alumni, students and faculty of the University into openly hostile camps and is inevitably developing a spirit of disloyalty, criticism and antagonism, which is as disintegrating to character as it is fatal to scholarship; and

WHEREAS, they feel that the sentiment of the representative alumni was neither accurately nor adequately expressed in the resolutions adopted in Worcester in June, 1923, and that the entire alumni body, wherever located, are deeply concerned with the future of the university, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the undersigned, alumni of Clark University, urge upon the board of trustees the immediate removal of the president, the responsible head of the present administration, and his replacement by an educational administrator who will be able to gather about him a body of teachers and students responsive to the highest educational ideals and thus restore Clark to its former enviable position in the educational world; be it further

Resolved, That the undersigned alumni heartily indorse the recent action of the Washington Alumni Club and the Pacific Coast Alumni in adopting a set of resolutions of like purpose and that they urge other bodies of interested alumni to take similar action, and further urge all alumni to acquaint themselves fully with the present situation in the university in the confidence that such knowledge will lead them to similar action; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to each member of the board of trustees, to the Washington Alumni, to the Pacific Coast Alumni, and given other necessary publicity.

Edmund G. E. Anderson, graduate student, Brown University; Karl W. Bigelow, tutor in economics, Harvard University; Phyllis Blanchard, Ph.D., psychologist, national committee for mental hygiene, Red Bank, N. J.; Lawrence E. Bliss, A.B., instructor in English, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.; Thaddeus L. Bolton, Ph.D., professor of psychology, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa.; Grace A. Cockcroft, M.A., professor of history, Skidmore College; Leo H. Dawson, Ph.D., assistant professor of physics, University of Maine; Elizabeth A. Dexter, Ph.D., professor of history, Skidmore College; Robert Dexter, Ph.D., professor of sociology, Skidmore College; W. T. M. Forbes, Ph.D., entomologist, Cornell University; H. M. Halverson, Ph.D., professor of psychology, University of Maine; Dorothy Hanson, A.M., teacher of English, Westport High School, Westport, Conn.; A. H. Imlah, A.M., instructor of history, University of Maine; Hugh L. Keenleyside, Ph.D., assistant professor of history, Syracuse University; Clifford Kirkpatrick, M.A., instructor in sociology, Brown University; M. M. Knight, Ph.D., assistant professor of history, Barnard College; Ivan E. McDougale, Ph.D., professor of economics and sociology, Goucher College; C. F. Mullette, M.A., instructor of history, Syracuse University; Josiah Morse, Ph.D., professor of psychology and philosophy, University of South Carolina; Howard D. Odum, Ph.D., professor of sociology, University of North Carolina; T. P. Peardon, A.M., instructor in history, Barnard College; Iva Lowther Peters, Ph.D., professor of economics and sociology, Goucher College; Marjory Bates Pratt, Ph.D., instructor in psychology, Wellesley College; Sheldon B. Smith, A.B., instructor in history, Brattleboro High School, Brattleboro, Vt.; Donald R. Taft, Ph.D., professor of economics and sociology, Wells College;

William Marton Wheeler, Ph.D., Sc.D., dean of Bussey Institution, Harvard University; E. R. Wood, M.A., associate professor of psychology, Kansas State Normal College; Earl F. Zinn, Ph.D., executive secretary National Research Council.

[Similar resolutions were presented by a group of 19 Clark Alumni on the Pacific Coast in 1923.]

GENERAL READING FOR UNDERGRADUATES REPORT OF COMMITTEE G¹

I

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. American association of university professors.² Bulletin, October, 1922, p. 11, 25, 27, 35.
2. Austen, Willard. Some requirements of university libraries. Educational review, v. 27, 1904, p. 258.
- 2a. Aydelotte, Frank. Honors courses in American colleges and universities. National research council. Bulletin, v. 7, no. 40, 1924.
3. Babbitt, Irving. Literature and the American college. Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin company, 1908, p. 209.
4. Baird, G. M. What one hundred freshmen read. School and society, v. 4, 1916, p. 254-257.
5. Bascom, John. The college library. Educational review, v. 38, 1909, p. 141-149.
6. Beyer, T. P. A college course in general reading. English journal, v. 12, 1923, p. 377-383.
7. Boraas, Julius. Teaching to think. New York, The Macmillan company, 1922, p. 211-212, 246-249.
8. Bryce, James. University and historical addresses. New York, The Macmillan company, 1913, p. 367-388. (Also in Fulton: see *infra*.)
9. Butler, N. M. Scholarship and service. New York, C. Scribner's sons, 1921, p. 188-189, 210-212.
10. Canfield, J. H. The library, everybody's workshop. Columbia university quarterly, v. 6, 1903/04, p. 245-246.
11. Carruth, W. H. College credit for browsing. School and society, v. 1, 1915, p. 660-664.
12. Columbia university. President's report, 1920, p. 22-23.

¹ Committee G is the Committee on Methods of Increasing the Intellectual Interest and Raising the Intellectual Standards of Undergraduates. The Committee's preliminary report, containing a survey of the field of its work, was published in the BULLETIN for February, 1922 (VIII, 60-69). The Committee's "Bibliography of Methods of Increasing the Intellectual Interest and Raising the Intellectual Standards of Undergraduates" was published in the BULLETIN for December, 1923 (IX, 385-418). A first special report, "Initiatory Courses for Freshmen," was published in the BULLETIN for October, 1922 (VIII, 350-8). A second special report, "Sectioning on the Basis of Ability," was published in the BULLETIN for October, 1923 (IX, 275-290). A third special report, "Extra-Collegiate Intellectual Service," was published in the BULLETIN for May, 1924 (X, 272-286). The present report was prepared for the Committee, as the signature indicates, by Professor Havens, of Ohio State University. In its final form the report includes modifications resulting from suggestions made by other members of the Committee.—Ernest H. Wilkins, Chairman.

² At the request of the committee, certain special methods of capitalization and punctuation have been used in this report.—Editor.

13. Cooper, C. S. The American undergraduate: how to interest students in good reading. *Century*, v. 83, 1911/12, p. 891-892.
14. Danton, G. H. Required reading and company. *Educational review*, v. 41, 1911, p. 510-515.
15. De Garmo, Charles. The lecture system in university teaching. *Educational review*, v. 23, 1902, p. 114-116.
16. Eliot, C. W. A new definition of the cultivated man. Present college questions. New York, D. Appleton and company, 1903. p. 13.
17. Ewer, B. C. College study and college life. Boston, R. G. Badger, 1917. p. 215-222.
18. Fulton, M. G., editor. College life, its conditions and problems. New York, The Macmillan company, 1914. p. ix-xii, 304-340. (Contains Bryce: see *supra*.)
19. Gladden, Washington. Commencement days. New York, The Macmillan company, 1916. p. 143-161.
20. Hamline university. Catalog, 1922/23, p. 23-24, 35-37.
21. Harris, L. H. Culture and the college fraternity. *School and society*, v. 2, 1915, p. 661-664.
22. Henry, R. L., Jr. Oxford educational methods. *Chicago alumni magazine*, v. 1, 1907, p. 58-59, 104.
23. Hewitt, J. H. History of American teaching. *Educational review*, v. 39, 1910, p. 232-233.
24. Hills, E. C. Should colleges institute a general examination? *Educational review*, v. 62, 1921, p. 427-435.
25. Hooker, B. R. The use of literary material in teaching composition. *School review*, v. 10, 1902, p. 474-485.
26. Hopkins, E. M. English in the colleges. National education association of the United States. *Journal of proceedings and addresses*, v. 55, 1917, p. 706.
27. Jones, C. E. Sources of interest in high school English. New York, American book company, 1912.
28. Keppel, F. P. The undergraduate and his college. Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin company, 1917. p. 203-205.
29. Lefevre, A. The organization and administration of a state's institutions of higher education. Austin, Texas, von Boeckmann-Jones, 1914. p. 414-415.
30. McGrane, R. C. The bane of our colleges. *School and society*, v. 13, 1921, p. 161.

31. Mead, A. R. Personal relations with individual students. National education association of the United States. Journal of proceedings and addresses, v. 50, 1912, p. 797.
32. The Nation. v. 101, 1915, p. 590.
33. New Republic supplement, October 25, 1922, The American college and its curriculum, p. 4-8, 11, 13-15.
34. Oberlin college. President's report, 1908/09, p. 175.
35. Pearson, E. L. The book table. Outlook, v. 135, 1923, p. 71-72.
36. Phelps, W. L. Teaching in school and college. New York, The Macmillan company, 1912. p. 143-145, 166-170.
37. Purington, Florence. Does the college emphasize service to others to the detriment of personal development? National education association of the United States. Journal of proceedings and addresses, v. 59, 1921, p. 420.
38. Schevill, Rudolph. Some neglected standards and values. University of California chronicle, v. 15, 1913, p. 348, 351-352.
39. Scribner's magazine. The point of view. v. 34, 1903, p. 633-634.
40. Shackford, M. H. The practical side of preparation in literature. School review, v. 14, 1906, p. 223-225.
41. Slosson, E. E. Great American universities. New York, The Macmillan company, 1910. p. 49-50.
42. Tatlock, J. S. P. Intellectual interests of undergraduates. University of California chronicle, v. 23, 1921, p. 370-371, 382, 390.
43. Union college. President's report, 1922/23, p. 43-44.
44. U. S. Bureau of education. Report of the commissioner, 1905. v. 1, p. 539.
45. Walker, Williston. The integration of the university. Educational problems in college and university, ed. by J. L. Brumm. Ann Arbor, 1921. p. 88-90.
46. West, A. F. The present peril to liberal education. Present college questions. New York, D. Appleton and company, 1903. p. 35-37.
47. Wilson, L. N. Further suggestions for a model private library at college. Clark university library. Publications, April, 1913, p. 1-30. (Repeats with additions an article of February, 1912, in the same publication.)

II

SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS

It is hardly necessary to take space to summarize arguments in favor of the desirability of more general reading on the part of the undergraduate. In general, there is marked dissatisfaction both with the amount and the quality of the voluntary reading done by the college student (32¹ 590; 3 208-09; 41 49-50; 37 420) and a tendency, probably somewhat, but not wholly, exaggerated (42 371; 33 13), to glorify the amount of general reading done under the more limited curriculum of former days (23 232-33). In this connection Mr. Bernard C. Ewer rightly observes that what in the college of an older time "belonged to general reading—necessarily so if read at all—now has a home in this or that course of study" (17 215 ff.). At present, says Mr. W. H. Carruth, "only the rarest few find time or inclination to read classical and standard literature that is not within the straight and narrow path of the curriculum" (11 661). Mr. J. C. Green reports of Princeton freshmen that they "are entirely unaccustomed to the use of a library" (1 25).

Mr. Charles De Garino says that "the test for the value of a lecture is the degree of response it awakens in the student. The arts department of a modern university is almost wholly lacking in machinery for securing an adequate response to the lecture from the undergraduate student. . . . The improvements most imperatively needed are: (1) An adequate supply of instructors to conduct discussions and to guide and fructify the reading; (2) A sufficient number of seminary or other isolated reading rooms; (3) The purchase by the library of several copies each of the epoch-making books in each department; (4) The home use of books by the student for definite lengths of time" (15 115-16).

Dean Florence Purington says of students at Mount Holyoke: "I am inclined to think that a large proportion of our students read as much as time will allow. One difficulty is that so many of them read very slowly, so that they are barely able to cover their assignments. . . . Those who do read outside what is required in their courses, too often confine their choice to the *Woman's Home Com-*

¹ These numbers indicate the works so numbered in the preceding Bibliography; the numbers in italic type refer to pages.

panion, *The Ladies' Home Journal*, the *Saturday Evening Post*, and a light quality of fiction" (37 420). In regard to this matter of slowness in reading, Mr. Julius Boraas advises teaching students to change from the "syllable or word method" to the "paragraph method." He says: "The speediest reader that I have found among college students could read ten ordinary pages in about three minutes and could give the gist of what he had read quite as well as those who read more slowly. The ordinary reader will do very well if he reads ten pages in ten minutes" (7 248). Mr. Boraas suggests that a certain amount of supervised study might help the student to acquire discrimination and rapidity in reading. Of course there is much reading which cannot, or should not, be done at this breakneck speed. The student must learn to read at different rates according to the nature of the subject matter or the object in view, and he must guard himself carefully against the danger of superficiality (18 335).

"Free reading" courses for good students (42 382-83; 385-91; 11 662), the formation of "reading groups," faculty guidance in the building up of fraternity libraries (21 661-64), closer social relations between faculty and students, the calling in from outside, for companionship with gifted students, of specially distinguished men, as has been done at Miami, Michigan, Amherst, and some other places (45 90), these are some of the interesting suggestions for the stimulation of student reading. Mr. Tatlock observes that marked improving of the standard of scholarship and of the quantity of work demanded would greatly promote intellectual interests by excluding those who lower the standard. This, together with general comprehensive examinations, recommended by Mr. E. C. Hills (24 427-35), and the use of tutors or preceptors as at Oxford and Cambridge, and more recently at certain institutions in this country, would doubtless have the effect of stimulating student reading (42 385-90). Mr. R. L. Henry states that he found that the Oxford undergraduate, even the pass student, reads much more than the American undergraduate. The existence of numerous literary clubs, the long vacations for reading, living in the country free from many of the distractions of city life, these are among the influences he thought worked in this direction (22 58-59, 104). The Brown (17 221-22), the Columbia (12 22-23), and the Hamline (20 35-37) book lists also deserve special mention here.

III

SUMMARY OF COLLEGIATE EXPERIENCE

Systematic attempts to deal with the problem of student reading are of comparatively recent date and constitute little more than a beginning. In this connection the report on Initiatory Courses for Freshmen published in the *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors* for October, 1922 has an important bearing. In so far as these courses succeed in their aim of stimulating the intellectual life, they are also bound to stimulate the habit of general reading. One of the aims of the course at Amherst is stated to be: "To teach Freshmen to use the library, read newspapers and magazines, make reports and carry on discussions of live topics and issues" (1 11). Professor Logan, who conducts a similar course at Rutgers, says: "I am preparing to have the sections spend some time at the beginning on 'How to Read' and 'How to Study.'" He further adds: "The reading is done in the Library, and is similar to laboratory work in that definite problems are assigned and the reading is somewhat supervised" (1 27). The following recommendation of the committee's report is pertinent: "If possible two special rooms in the library should be devoted to this course: a large room stocked with an adequate number of copies of the books most generally referred to, and an adjacent room for conversation—since all possible means should be employed to encourage discussion of the course among the students" (1 35). Mr. Louis N. Wilson of the Clark University Library has published tentative book lists the aim of which is to guide in the formation of a model "private library" of about two thousand volumes (47 1-30). This collection, arranged in a special cozy room for the purpose, would form a *college* library from which the student could select books for his general reading without being overwhelmed by a mass of books chosen with quite different aims in mind.

Columbia, in its establishment of a special two years' course of reading to be followed by candidates for the degree of Bachelor of Arts with general honors, has grappled directly with the problem, though not completely, for only the honor students, not the rank and file, are included in the plan. On the reading list for this honor group are the following: Homer, Herodotus, Thucydides, Aeschylus,

Sophocles, Euripides, Aristophanes, Plato, Aristotle, Lucretius, Horace, Plutarch, Marcus Aurelius, Saint Augustine, the Niebelungenlied, the Song of Roland, Saint Thomas Aquinas, Dante, Petrarch, Montaigne, Shakespeare, Cervantes, Francis Bacon, Milton, Molière, David Hume, Montesquieu, Voltaire, Rousseau, Adam Smith, Lessing, Kant, Schiller, Goethe, Macaulay, Victor Hugo, Hegel, Darwin, Lyell, Tolstoi, Nietzsche. President Butler comments: "This provides a rich feast of reason, and if it is wanting in any respect it is in not sufficiently representing the fine arts, other than poetry, which have in every age been the finest flower of a people's aspiration" (12 22-23). The omission of a literary classic like the English Bible is very surprising when one recalls how great has been its influence upon English and American thought and style. Professor Erskine further explains in regard to this course: "The students who elect General Honors meet with a group of instructors every Wednesday evening for two hours, sometimes much longer, to talk over the book of the week—the 'Divine Comedy' or the 'Wealth of Nations,' or the 'Origin of Species.' Much of the reading is done in the preceding summer vacation, but the student must be ready to discuss it with at least as much precision of reference as he would discuss a novel he had recently read. One instructor leads the discussion, which soon becomes a genuine give-and-take between him and his colleagues as well as between instructors and students. . . . The General Honors course is open to Juniors and Seniors. It is elected in the current year by over a hundred students, and it seems likely to succeed in its purpose, so far as it reaches the college body; already those who have taken it are conscious of an intellectual life in common" (33 13).

Hamline University inaugurated two years ago a reading plan intended for all students. This, and the fact that it does not include weekly meetings for discussion between faculty and students, are the essential differences from the Columbia plan. Its chief provisions are as follows: "(1) Every candidate for graduation is required to read ten books selected from a list of ninety¹ with the advice of a member of the faculty committee or the head of the department in which he is taking major work. (2) Candidates for *honors* read twelve; for *high honors*, fifteen; and for *highest honors*, twenty.¹ (3) A three-hour credit, as for a regular semester course, is allowed

¹ These figures are somewhat changed by comparison with the announcement for 1923 and are given as now in force.

for this course, and while the total requirement for graduation is correspondingly increased, credits thus gained are computed for honor points and general scholastic standing. (4) Students are urged to begin reading in the freshman year or early in the sophomore year at latest. (5) A preliminary examination is given to Juniors, at which time the examining committee may point out defects observable in methods of reading, and make suggestions for future reading. (6) A final examination is held for Seniors during the first semester. The form or method of examination has been the subject of considerable discussion, and is undoubtedly a vexed question. The plan at present in use is a one-hour oral examination or discussion for each student, before a committee of three" (6 380-81).

Smith College, instead of general honors, has adopted a system of special honors. During the last two years of the college course, the more able students are "relieved from the requirements of the regular curriculum and the whole routine of the compulsory class attendance, marks and the like, and are allowed to choose, with the approval of the departments concerned, a certain field of learning for intensive cultivation. . . . Instruction is given by personal conferences at which problems are proposed, appropriate reading is suggested, and criticism of previous work is offered. . . . The student is at liberty to visit whatever lectures in the college may bear upon her special studies. . . . The last semester is devoted to the writing of a longer paper and to a general review in preparation for the drastic final examination which covers the whole field of the work of the last two years" (33 11). Although this is specialized, rather than general, reading, it tends toward putting more of the responsibility for his education upon the student and consequently helps to develop self-reliance and individual initiative in reading, two important factors which with a little suggestion and guidance by faculty friends and advisors would almost inevitably produce results in general reading outside of the special major field.

Harvard has adopted a requirement of concentration and a system of general final examinations, demanding among other things that the candidate must do "a substantial amount of work apart from the formal courses, and especially by reading and reflection coordinate the details he has learned into a body of ordered knowledge of his subject, so far as an undergraduate can be expected to do so." Some departments employ tutors. "These men give most of their time to

weekly meetings with individual students to discuss with them their reading, to help them solve their difficulties, and to give them suggestions for their future guidance. The tutor is in no sense a coach, but a friendly counselor, whose knowledge and wisdom are put at the disposal of each student." In departments which do not employ tutors, "all the members of the teaching force give much advice outside the class room to individual students." Among other results of this system, Professor Moore says that "it develops habits of independent reading and of reflection on the part of the student" (33 14-15).

The well known preceptorial system in use at Princeton has had the effect of stimulating student reading (44 539; 31 797). It is an excellent plan, but the enormous expense of providing completely the large instructional staff it demands has prevented it from being carried as far as was at first contemplated (42 386-88).

A number of other features recently put into force at Princeton are also of interest. A reading plan for Juniors and Seniors has been adopted by which the student's schedule is reduced from fifteen to twelve hours of class work per week, six hours in a department of his choice, six outside the department, while he is expected to do a large amount of reading and study in the field of his chosen department, but not immediately related to the courses which he is taking. In regard to this reading the student may consult a member of the faculty when he thinks it desirable, but he is expected to be his own taskmaster, and to be as far as possible independent of close faculty supervision. At the end of the junior year he takes a general examination on his whole work in his department, both that done in courses and that done independently. At the end of the senior year he is examined on the whole work of the two years in the department chosen. Professor Root writes: "It is too early to decide on the complete success of the plan; but it is already plain that our Juniors are reading more widely and more intelligently because of the responsibility now resting on them to master not individual courses, but a whole subject." It should also be noted that early in the freshman year the whole class is given instruction in the use of the Library, and taken through the stacks in small personally conducted groups. The stacks are kept open to the whole undergraduate body, and it is said that one frequently sees undergraduates wandering through the stacks and examining the books. Moreover, in response

to a request from members of the faculty, the Brick Row Book Shop, Inc., of New York has opened at Princeton, just across the street from the Campus, a shop where there is a good stock of second-hand books and of the best current books. This is in addition to the regular college book store, which handles all textbooks. The salesmen are college graduates who can advise a student as to his reading. Students are encouraged to frequent the shop whether they buy or not. This special type of book store has greatly encouraged the habit of buying and reading good books.

The new course in Humanities at Wisconsin (33 8-9) and the requirements for honors and the establishment of a department of Biography at Carleton (33 7) should have a favorable effect upon student reading. Nebraska (33 6) contemplates the adoption of a system which appears similar to that already explained as in force at Smith. In its newly adopted Arts College Course, Ohio State will require all students in their junior year to take a three-hour course for one quarter in two of the following fields: (a) Latin and Greek literature, (b) Romance literature, (c) German literature, or (d) English literature. These courses and the reading for them are to be carried on in English and must be selected from a field other than that of the student's major. In the senior year, students majoring in subjects outside of the natural sciences are to fulfill a similar requirement in the "Development of Modern Science," while students majoring in the natural sciences are to take a corresponding course in the "Development of Modern Civilization." It should prove possible to give these courses in a way greatly to stimulate general reading on the part of the student.

A book catalog, such as is published from time to time and distributed among the students by the Harvard Cooperative Society, is said to have a good effect in stimulating student reading. It is attractively prepared, the books offered are both interesting and distinctly worth while, the sentence quotations on the value of books and reading, which are found on each page, are bound to have an effect upon any student who is in the slightest degree sensitive to the opinions of leaders of the race. Similar catalogs in other places—many doubtless already exist—properly adapted to the environment and to the financial situation of the majority of the students would certainly tend to encourage reading and that great desideratum, the ownership of good books.

IV

SUGGESTIONS

Students and faculty both need leisure, leisure for thought and leisure for reading. The general speeding up of modern life, the unceasing social demands, the consequent emphasis upon activity and bustle rather than upon unhurried reflection and study, these are characteristics of the age and can be modified only slowly and with difficulty. To what extent do our highly departmentalized faculties themselves read widely? Yet a scholar, in the fine original sense, is a man in whose development leisure is essential.

The following suggestions are made, not with the thought that all could or should be followed in any one place, but that all are worthy of consideration and that a large number of them at any rate could be adapted to the different conditions obtaining in different institutions.

1. Choice of instructors of broad reading and human interests is of fundamental importance. This involves suitable changes in previous undergraduate training, in salaries, and in undergraduate sentiment toward the teaching profession, so that the best men can be recruited. There should be a shift in emphasis on the part of college authorities from formal research alone to broad culture and powerful stimulating teaching. Publication and the competitive bidding of other institutions should have a less decisive influence upon promotion than at present. This does not mean the minimizing of scholarship. It does mean making every effort to recognize and promote good teachers. This can be done if administrators wholeheartedly desire it. Scholarship and good teaching should and can go hand in hand. The younger men should be in every way encouraged to develop themselves as evenly as possible in both these directions.

2. The definite shaping of courses, as far as possible, toward the stimulation of interest and of outside, independent reading. The student must be made to feel that he and he alone in the last analysis is responsible for his education, that he must take himself in hand and by independent reading and thought *educate himself*, since no one else can *educate* him, that the college furnishes facilities, stimulus, guidance, and help, but that all collegiate work is "without form and

void" until the student by his voluntary intellectual activity vivifies it and gives it meaning.

3. Making the primary aim of courses the development of those students who are capable and intelligent (not necessarily brilliant) and the excusing of good students from routine requirements whenever possible and the mapping out for them of independent reading. If followed by all departments, this plan would very soon produce *general* reading. This does not require elaborate machinery. It should be the general policy of each instructor with the cooperation and the guidance of heads of departments.

4. Small classes with twenty to twenty-five students as a maximum in recitation or quiz sections, and the use, where possible, of tutors or preceptors meeting the students at least once a week in even smaller groups, have stimulated student reading. See the forthcoming report of this committee on "The Preceptorial or Tutorial System."

5. The introduction of a Special Initiatory Course for Freshmen, with teaching of methods of reading, study, use of reference books, and elementary hints on bibliography, has been found, by many institutions, to be helpful in encouraging general reading. Its success—as is true of most teaching—seems to have been in proportion as capable teachers have been provided for students in relatively small groups.

6. Reading for Honors somewhat after the Columbia plan and general reading for all students, as at Hamline, have been found useful. Such reading should increasingly be put upon as much of a voluntary basis as is consistent with human nature. Otherwise such courses run the risk of becoming more or less prescribed like regular courses. Nevertheless prescribed reading is better than none, and may easily lead to voluntary, independent reading.

7. General examinations at the end of the college course for which the student prepares himself in part, as at Harvard and at Princeton, by reading done independently. See the forthcoming report of this Committee on "The General Final Examination in the Major Study."

8. Stimulating lecturers from on or off the campus to show students the value and the necessity of good reading independently undertaken. Such lecturers should be more often exponents of the results of wide reading and of success in intellectual, not merely

material, endeavor. Student sentiment in general must increasingly be brought to favor the intellectual life.

9. Providing a comfortable and attractive reading room with about two thousand selected volumes as in the Clark plan.

10. Cooperation of the faculty in the formation of student reading groups and in the development of fraternity libraries.

11. Personal contact of faculty and students as much as possible in homes, fraternities, literary, scientific, and other similar societies for students. Faculty advisors who accept their responsibility and function.

12. Election to Phi Beta Kappa or to similar scholastic organizations at the end of the junior or early in the senior year and the holding of frequent dinner or luncheon meetings where there should be a good speaker and stimulating discussion. Such honorary scholastic fraternities should function in the life of the undergraduate in a way they usually do not at present. This would tend to stimulate the intellectual life, and hence student reading, not only among the small group directly affected but also in the undergraduate body at large.

13. Frequent issuance to students of attractive book catalogs offering worth while books within the means of the average undergraduate student somewhat like the catalog of the Harvard Co-operative Society.

14. Establishment where practicable of a book store like the Brick Row Book Shop at Princeton.

15. Issuance to all students by a carefully chosen faculty committee of selected book lists. It would seem best that these should be short lists, issued rather frequently, perhaps every two months, and changing to meet different tastes. They should contain each time one or two titles from the very best of current offerings, but should mainly call attention to those that have already stood the test of time. A longer general list might well be kept posted in several conspicuous places in the Library, as at Brown. In connection with such reading plans as are followed at Columbia and at Hamline, such a general list ought to have constant publicity.

Ohio State University.

GEORGE R. HAVENS.

MEMBERSHIP

MEMBERS ELECTED

The Committee on Admission announces the election of eighty-two members, as follows:

Allegheny College, Lee D. McClean; **Boston University**, C. P. Huse; **Brown University**, W. A. Berridge, R. F. Chambers, B. C. Clough, V. W. Crane, K. O. Mason, E. F. Wood; **University of California**, M. Y. Hughes, C. E. Kany, W. M. Latimer; **Carleton College**, Florence H. Churton, Mary S. Crawford, O. C. Helming, Eleanor J. Pellet, C. J. Ritchey, H. E. Stork; **Carnegie Institute of Technology**, Susan T. Canfield; **Carroll College**, May N. Rankin; **University of Cincinnati**, E. E. Eubank; **University of Idaho**, Florence R. Sharp; **University of Illinois**, Alta G. Saunders; **Iowa State College**, C. H. Cowgill, A. K. Friedrich, H. B. Hawthorn, C. C. Major, C. C. Ross, R. H. Wagner; **Lawrence College**, J. H. Farley; **University of Maryland**, J. A. Gamble; **Miami University**, A. B. Williamson; **University of Minnesota**, W. F. Holman, R. E. Kirk, F. H. MacDougal, Kemp Malone, L. H. Reyerson, W. T. Ryan, T. E. Steward, D. F. Swenson; **University of New Hampshire**, W. P. Lewis; **North Dakota Agricultural College**, J. E. Chapman; **Northwestern University**, E. S. Heath; **Ohio State University**, Walter French; **Oklahoma Agricultural College**, Nora A. Talbot; **University of Oklahoma**, G. E. Anderson, C. J. Bollinger, W. S. Campbell, A. K. Christian, N. A. Court, Patricio Gimeno, R. E. Jeffs, H. D. Moor, J. O. Moseley, Alma J. Neill, C. M. Perry, A. R. Ramey, H. C. Roys, A. M. Ruggles, L. S. Salter, Stephen Scatori, William Schriever, J. W. Sturgis, S. W. Swenson, Samuel Wediman, M. O. Wilson; **Oregon Agricultural College**, Stuart Sims; **University of Pittsburgh**, H. H. Collins; **Princeton University**, R. M. Field, A. E. Morse, H. L. Savage, Ira Wade, W. L. Whittlesey; **Ripon College**, Mary A. M. Gardner; **St. John's College**, D. M. Garrison; **St. Stephen's College**, L. R. Shero; **University of Southern California**, K. M. Bissell, W. C. Smith; **Stanford University**, Elisabeth L. Buckingham; **University of Toledo**, Carl Holliday; **Washington University**, Orval Bennett, L. D. Herrold, A. L. Hughes.

NOMINATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP

The following one hundred and fifty-four nominations are printed as provided under Article IV of the Constitution. Objection to any nominee may be addressed to the Secretary, H. W. Tyler, Cambridge, Mass., or to the Chairman of the Committee on Admissions¹ and will be considered by the Committee if received before December 1, 1924.

The Committee on Admissions consists of Florence Bascom (Bryn Mawr), Chairman, J. Q. Dealey (Brown), A. R. Hohlfeld (Wisconsin), A. L. Keith (South Dakota), G. H. Marx (Stanford), F. A. Saunders (Harvard), and F. C. Woodward (Chicago).

Herbert F. Allen (English), California (So. Branch)
John Alley (Government), Oklahoma
C. C. Anderson (Education), Kentucky
J. G. Arbuthnot (Physical Education), Washington (Seattle)
Henry K. Benson (Chemical Engineering), Washington (Seattle)
B. A. Bernstein (Mathematics), California
David K. Bjork (History), California (So. Branch)
Frederic T. Blanchard (English), California (So. Branch)
E. S. Bogardus (Sociology), So. California
Willard H. Bonner (English), Buffalo
Olga Bridgman (Psychology), California
W. M. Brodie (Mathematics), Virginia Polytechnic
Philip E. Bunker (Accounting), Syracuse
Paul S. Burgess (Agricultural Chemistry), Arizona
George N. Cade (Education), Arkansas
Niles Carpenter (Sociology), Buffalo
Loren T. Clark (Physics), So. California
W. P. Clark (Foreign Languages), Montana
Roy E. Clausen (Genetics), California
N. H. Clement (Romance Languages), California (So. Branch)
John N. Cobb (Fisheries), Washington (Seattle)
Nelson Coburn (Modern Languages), St. John's
Clarence R. Corey (Mines), Washington
Frederick W. Cozens (Physical Education), California (So. Branch)
Wm. Ransom Crowell (Chemistry), California (So. Branch)
Paul H. Daus (Mathematics), California (So. Branch)

¹ Nominations should in all cases be presented through the Secretary, H. W. Tyler, 222 Charles River Road, Cambridge, Mass.

Darrell H. Davis (Geography), Minnesota
Donald W. Davis (Biology), William and Mary
R. N. Davis (Dairy Husbandry), Arizona
L. S. Dederick (Mathematics), U. S. Naval Academy
Howard deForest (Biology), So. California
William Diamond (German), California (So. Branch)
L. E. Dodd (Physics), California (So. Branch)
Carl S. Downes (English), California (So. Branch)
Max S. Dunn (Chemistry), California (So. Branch)
Harvey L. Eby (Education), California (So. Branch)
Will E. Edington (Mathematics), Purdue
Hiram W. Edwards (Physics), California (So. Branch)
W. B. Ellett (Chemistry), Virginia Polytechnic
Arthur T. Evans (Botany), South Dakota State
Harry S. Everett (Mathematics), Bucknell
Alexander G. Fite (French), California (So. Branch)
Harry T. French (Anatomy), Dartmouth
F. D. Fromme (Plant Pathology), Virginia Polytechnic
G. Irving Gavett (Mathematics), Washington (Seattle)
Joseph R. Geiger (Philosophy and Psychology), William and Mary
George H. Gelsinger (Greek and English), William and Mary
W. H. George (Political Science), California (So. Branch)
Theodore G. Gronert (History), Arkansas
Frederic H. Guild (Political Science), Kansas
William R. Hardman (Mathematics), Purdue
Carlos E. Harrington (Mathematics), Buffalo
N. W. Harter (Mathematics), Thiel
G. B. Helmrich (Mechanical Engineering), Oklahoma
John G. Hill (Biblical Literature), So. California
W. T. Hodges (Education), William and Mary
C. W. Holdaway (Dairy Husbandry), Virginia Polytechnic
Henry F. Holtzclaw (Commerce), Oklahoma Agricultural
J. W. Hotson (Botany), Washington (Seattle)
P. H. Houston (English), California (So. Branch)
G. H. Hunt (Mathematics), California (So. Branch)
S. B. Hustvedt (English), California (So. Branch)
T. B. Hutchison (Agronomy), Virginia Polytechnic
Alvey M. Isanogle (Education), Western Maryland
Dwight Isely (Entomology), Arkansas

Cary F. Jacob (English), William and Mary
Glenn James (Mathematics), California (So. Branch)
Albert W. Jamison (Economics and Sociology), Arkansas
Richard Henry Jesse (Chemistry), Montana
Sydney E. Johnson (Anatomy), Louisville
Vern O. Knudsen (Physics), California (So. Branch)
Arthur H. Kuhlman (Animal Husbandry), South Dakota State
H. A. Langenhan (Pharmacy), Washington (Seattle)
Frank J. Laube (Political Science), Washington (Seattle)
Karl E. Leib (Business Administration), Washington (Seattle)
Frederick C. Leonard (Astronomy), California (So. Branch)
C. F. Littell (Political Science), Cornell College
Joseph B. Lockey (History), California (So. Branch)
Alfred E. Longueil (English), California (So. Branch)
George McC. McBrice (Geography), California (So. Branch)
Hughina McKay (Home Economics), Ohio State
A. P. McKinlay (Classical Literature), California (So. Branch)
A. D. McNair (Agriculture), Arkansas
Donald S. Mackay (Philosophy), California (So. Branch)
Edmund C. Magill (Agricultural Education), Virginia Polytechnic
Charles A. Marsh (English), California (So. Branch)
J. H. Marshburn (English), Oklahoma
Wendell E. Mason (Mathematics), California (So. Branch)
Charles C. May (Civil Engineering), Washington (Seattle)
Samuel C. May (Political Science), California
Bruno Meinecke (Latin), Carleton
C. E. Melville (Mathematics), Clark
A. S. Merrill (Mathematics), Montana
W. A. Montgomery (Ancient Languages), William and Mary
Caroline S. Moore (Biology), Redlands
David R. Moore (History), Oberlin
Richard L. Morton (History), William and Mary
Lewis I. Neikirk (Mathematics), Washington (Seattle)
Agnes Nelson (Home Economics), Arkansas
H. S. Noble (Economics), California (So. Branch)
Vasil Obreshkove (Zoology), Syracuse
Frank E. Older (Biology), California (So. Branch)
L. O'Shaughnessy (Mathematics), Virginia Polytechnic
John C. Parish (History), California (So. Branch)

Charles L. Porter (Biology), Purdue
H. H. Preston (Business Administration), Washington (Seattle)
Edgar D. Randolph (Education), Washington (Seattle)
W. McK. Reed (Pharmacy), Toledo
Charles M. Reinoehl (School Administration), Arkansas
R. G. Robb (Chemistry), William and Mary
Henry M. Robert, Jr. (Mathematics), U. S. Naval Academy
G. Ross Robertson (Chemistry), California (So. Branch)
F. L. Robeson (Physics), Virginia Polytechnic
Clarence H. Robison (Education), California (So. Branch)
Joseph E. Rowe (Mathematics), William and Mary
Frank B. Rowley (Mechanical Engineering), Minnesota
Charles Russell (Education), Toledo
Frank Schoell (French), California
Bonnie E. Scholes (Education), Purdue
W. E. Schreiber (Physical Education), Montana
Charles E. Seitz (Agricultural Engineering), Virginia Polytechnic
Norma Selbert (Public Health), Ohio State
G. D. Shallenberger (Physics), Montana
Lloyd L. Shaulis (Economics), William and Mary
Walter F. Shenton (Mathematics), U. S. Naval Academy
Lee Irvin Smith (Chemistry), Minnesota
T. C. Spaulding (Forestry), Montana
O. L. Sponsler (Biology), California (So. Branch)
Eva F. Stahl (English), Simpson
H. W. Stone (Chemistry), California (So. Branch)
Martin J. Stormzand (Education), California (So. Branch)
John T. Tate (Physics), Minnesota
Paul W. Terry (Education), Washington (Seattle)
Clarence D. Thorpe (English), Oregon
B. H. VanOot (Education), Virginia Polytechnic
Walter B. Veazie (Philosophy), Colorado
F. P. Vickery (Geology), California (So. Branch)
J. O. Ware (Agronomy), Arkansas
Harry R. Warfel (English), Bucknell
Julian S. Waterman (Law), Arkansas
J. W. Watson (Chemistry), Virginia Polytechnic
C. H. Watts (Commerce and Accounting), Toledo
Karl T. Waugh (Psychology), California (So. Branch)

Victor Whitehouse (Spanish), Ohio University
Frank C. Whitmore (Chemistry), Northwestern
Arthur G. Williams (Modern Languages), William and Mary
Frank B. Williams (Mathematics), Clark
J. A. Williams (Education) South Dakota State
Levi T. Wilson (Mathematics), U. S. Naval Academy
William R. Wilson (Psychology), Washington (Seattle)
R. M. Winger (Mathematics), Washington (Seattle)
T. K. Wolfe (Agronomy) Virginia Polytechnic
John L. Worcester (Anatomy), Washington (Seattle)
R. C. Young (Physics), William and Mary